

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>o</sup> LVII. OCTOBER 1889.

---

ART. I.—ROMAN INFALLIBILITY.

*The Infallibility of the Church: A Course of Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin.* By GEORGE SALMON, D.D. (London, 1888.)

THERE have been times during the protracted controversy between the Roman and Anglican Churches when the former has been more successful in the conduct of the debate, and the latter has failed to present its case with adequate cogency; when even its advocates seemed to be disheartened, and to argue rather from traditional prepossession than with hopes of victory. And when such conjunctures have occurred, they have usually been attended with a marked influx of converts to the Roman body, more affected by the immediate aspect of the contending schools than competent to estimate aright the wider issues involved.

But no one who has given attention to the question can doubt that for some considerable time past, and certainly ever since the Vatican Council, the Roman Church has been getting much the worse in the encounter; its opponents have not merely stood firmly on the defensive, but have assumed the offensive attitude, and have carried the war away from their own borders, and far within the Roman frontier, making no little havoc on their road. And amongst the champions who have penetrated farthest, and have left most tokens of their foray, Dr. Salmon takes a foremost place. Already known in the field of theology by his valuable *Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*, he has disclosed himself in the volume before us as a controversialist of the highest type, uniting deep erudition, incisive dialectic, luminous diction, and last, but by no means least in efficacy, a keen sense of humour. The temper, moreover, in

VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVII.

B

370632

which he has approached his task merits commendation. He tells us in his preface that while he much prefers that part of his work as a teacher which engaged him in the defence of truths held in common by all Christians, rather than with discussing points of difference between Christians, yet that he has felt pleasure in preparing this course of lectures as doing something to remove the greatest obstacle to Christian union. For the war with unbelief has of late become so extensive in area and so hot in conflict that it has drawn and is drawing Christians closer together, since they feel that the things on which they agree are more important than those on which they differ. But the Roman Church alone holds out, refusing any union save on the terms of unconditional submission to herself, such submission further involving the acknowledgment of certain things as true which we have good reasons for knowing to be false.

'I am not so silly,' he says in this connexion, 'as to imagine that any perceptible effect can follow from adding one to the many demonstrations that have been given that the claims of which I speak are unfounded. But no false opinion can resist for ever the continual dropping of repeated disproofs. We may point out instance after instance in which papal authority has been given to decisions now known to be erroneous, and in each case some ingenious attempt may be made to show that the attribute of infallibility did not attach to the erroneous decision; but sooner or later men must awake to see that the result of all this special pleading is that, whereas they expected to find a guide who would always lead them right, they have got instead a guide who can find some plausible excuse to make every time he leads them wrong' (Preface, p. viii).

And he suggests that perhaps the popularity of the theory of development amongst Roman Catholics may provide a road out of the Infallibility *impasse* by giving the Church the right to review former decisions and to abandon claims proved to be untenable.

Large as this book is, it is strictly confined to the single point named in its title, no other detail of the Roman controversy being discussed. And that, as Dr. Salmon explains, because

'arguments are useless if addressed to those who profess to be above argument. As the controversy is conducted at the present day, everything turns on the power claimed for the Pope of determining and declaring, without any attempt to produce evidence, what are or are not Apostolic traditions. There really is but one question to be settled: Are we bound to take the Pope's unproved assertions without any attempt to test by argument whether they are true or not? He may declare in words that he has no commission to make

revela  
revela  
we are  
He m  
ceptic  
centu  
Apost  
doctri  
it is o

T  
touch  
which  
attrib  
extre  
use o  
to an  
Roma  
formi  
point  
unbel  
or eve  
the la  
an u  
But h  
differ  
prote  
one t  
ourse  
way.

T  
inquin  
Script  
famili  
denta  
the R  
make  
grave  
tive n  
Catho  
thus i  
making  
and s  
the B  
he wil  
Fathe



revelation of new doctrine, but only to hand down faithfully the revelation made through the Apostles ; but what does that avail if we are bound to take his word whether a doctrine be new or not ? He may propound a doctrine such as that of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, which it is certain that the Church for centuries never regarded as part of the revelation made through the Apostles, and it is held that we are bound not only to believe that doctrine to be true, but also to believe, on the Pope's authority, that it is old ' (Preface, p. ix).

The first lecture of the course is purely introductory, and touches first on the decline of interest in the controversy which has been observable for some time past. Dr. Salmon attributes this to various causes : to reaction from some extreme over-statements upon the anti-Roman side ; to the use of Roman Catholic books of devotion in England ; and to an inclination in this country to sympathize more with Roman Catholics than with Dissenters, who are at once more formidable enemies to the Church of England and have fewer points of contact in belief and polity with the Church ; to unbelief and scepticism, the former inducing sympathy with, or even submission to, Rome as a bulwark against its inroads, the latter disinclining men to trouble themselves about such an unimportant matter as religious belief is in their eyes. But he utters warnings against indulging this temper of indifference, since, if Romanism be erroneous, we are bound to protect ourselves and others against its errors ; if it be the one true religious system, we are not justified in holding ourselves aloof from it, and are thus bound to inquire, either way.

Then, passing to the consideration of the methods of inquiry and controversy, he begins with the place of Holy Scripture, which he truly says serves, when once made familiar, as a safeguard from defection to Romanism, as incidentally shown by the discouragement of Biblical study by the Roman Church, which instinctively feels that it does not make for her contentions. But he points out that it is a grave mistake to suppose that quoting a few texts is an effective mode of carrying on the controversy, because the Roman Catholic disputant is not usually familiar with the Bible, and thus is not much influenced by it ; he assumes that quotations making against his belief and practice must be unfairly made, and so contradict the fuller evidence ; he will argue against the Bible itself rather than allow its adverse testimony ; and he will, finally, adduce quotations to show that the ancient Fathers held with Rome, and that anti-Roman interpretations

are all modern, and opposed to the judgment of all antiquity. Dr. Salmon next gives a general warning against the intermeddling of untrained persons in the debate, because they are certain to use weak arguments, which not merely fail on their own merits, but discredit even strong arguments which happen to be adduced along with them, and so seriously damage the side which has alleged them; and that, apart from the yet more serious objection that bad arguments, if known as such, are immoral, and thus unfit to be used by any whose aim is truth rather than victory.

In the second lecture Dr. Salmon proceeds to exhibit the cardinal importance of the question of Infallibility. This he does by pointing out that it is absolutely useless to prove that a given Roman doctrine is not contained in Scripture, nay, is even contradicted by Scripture, if on the one hand we have to admit that the Roman Church has access to other trustworthy sources as to the doctrine taught by our Lord and the Apostles, and on the other that we are incompetent to decide what is Scripture or what is its true interpretation, and must perforce take our guidance in both these matters from Rome, whose teaching must, therefore, be confessed as always true alike, however it may seem to us to differ from itself at various dates. Once this view is accepted, he says truly, the mind which has received it becomes impenetrable to all arguments. But we somewhat doubt the relevancy of an illustration he brings in here: that this impenetrability denotes the entire faith not merely of the average Roman controversialist, but specifically of Cardinal Manning, in the Infallibility dogma. We feel he does the Cardinal's understanding great injustice by this personal reference. On the contrary, we may be absolutely certain that, however Cardinal Manning may value Infallibility as a convenient instrument of administrative discipline, he at least cannot be ignorant that it has been assailed by arguments which no impartial mind can afford to despise. Dr. Salmon is on surer ground when he cites the example of Cardinal Newman and some of his colleagues in the *Tracts for the Times*, who, after completely demonstrating the novelty and error of various Roman tenets, unconditionally surrendered, and accepted the very tenets they had refuted, because, having first persuaded themselves that there must be an infallible guide to truth, provided by Christ Himself, they accepted the Roman Church as that guide, merely because she alone claimed that office, and in default of her there was no other that they could see. But even they submitted in the conviction that the infallible

Chu  
spee  
purs  
and  
Imm  
foll  
sixt  
befo  
itself  
revo  
indir  
pick  
all, t  
silen  
upho  
alter  
the  
sam  
cont  
eyes  
hand  
for a  
Chu  
the

was  
in p  
leng  
rant  
hope  
reviv  
body  
with  
doct  
Dr.  
supp  
to b  
nific  
ingly

Scrit  
being  
word  
are ig  
but t

Church was also unchanging in her doctrine, and thus specially marked off from the heretical sects, always in pursuit of novelty and busied in the invention of fresh tenets; and they were rudely awakened by the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin in 1854, followed by the yet more portentous decree of Infallibility sixteen years later, despite of ample disproofs accumulated before the Vatican Council met, and even urged in that Council itself by some of the ablest prelates there. Hence, some have revolted, and retraced their steps, but the majority have been indifferent enough, or logical enough, to see that they cannot pick and choose, that if they accept a supreme authority at all, they must take all it pleases to impose, and so they are silent, and do not imitate the less logical Old Catholics, who upheld, till this last demand upon their obedience, every alteration which Rome had gradually made in the deposit of the faith. But then, as Dr. Salmon aptly says, there is just the same difference between looking back to old and half-forgotten controversies, and observing changes made under our very eyes, as there is between noting the movements of the hour-hand and of the second-hand of a watch; nor is it possible now for any intelligent person to credit the assertion that the Roman Church has in fact been unchanging in belief throughout all the Christian centuries.

He points out that the first wide revolt against Romanism was a consequence of the accessibility of the New Testament in printed vernacular translations. Up to then, when challenged, Rome had appealed to Scripture, alleging that war-rant for all she taught is to be found therein. Driven hopelessly from this position, Roman controversialists then revived the old Gnostic theory refuted by Irenæus, that a body of traditional doctrine, of equal account and authority with Scripture, exists in the Church, and proves all Roman doctrine for which Scripture authority is not forthcoming. Dr. Salmon neither embodies the words of Irenæus here, nor supplies a reference to the passage—an omission which ought to be made good in his next edition, for the point is too significant to be merely suggested and not proved. Accordingly we proceed to quote the most relevant clauses:

‘When they [the Valentinian heretics] are refuted out of the Scriptures, they turn round to blame the Scriptures themselves as not being accurate, as not being authoritative, and as being variously worded; and because the truth cannot be discovered by those who are ignorant of tradition; for the truth was not transmitted in writing, but by the living voice; for which reason Paul said, “We speak wis-

dom among them that are perfect, yet not the wisdom of this world." And this wisdom each of them declares to be that which he has himself invented. . . . But when we challenge them by appeal to the genuine tradition in our turn, that which has been preserved in the Churches by the successive Presbyters, they oppose tradition, saying that they are wiser than the Presbyters, nay, even than the Apostles, and have discovered the unalloyed truth.<sup>1</sup>

The felicity of this citation consists not merely in the verbal occurrence of the especial Roman watchword in the debate, 'the living voice,' as being also the trade-mark of ancient anti-Christian heresy, but for a further reason, applying to the closing sentences, which we can best give in Dr. Salmon's own words:

'But it would be too much to expect from us that we should admit a failure of Scripture proof in itself to constitute a proof by tradition. We have a right to ask, If the Church learned that doctrine by tradition, where has that tradition been recorded? Who are the ancient authors who mention it? If the thing has been handed down from the Apostles, the Church of the first centuries must have believed or practised it; let us inquire, as we should in the case of any other historical question, whether she did or not. . . . When two opposing generals meet in battle, and both send home bulletins of victory, and *Te Deums* are sung in churches on both sides, we, who sit at home, may find it hard to understand which way the battle has gone. But if we look at the map and see where the next battle is fought, and if we see that one general is making, 'for strategic reasons,' a constant succession of movements towards the rear, and that he ends by completely evacuating the country he at first undertook to defend, then we may suspect that his glorious victories were perhaps not quite so brilliant as he had represented them to be. And so, when the Church of England champions left the plain ground of Scripture, and proceeded to interchange quotations from the Fathers, plain men, out of whose sight the battle now went, might be excused for apprehension as to the results, themselves being scarcely competent to judge of the force of the passages quoted on each side. But when they find that the heads of the Roman Catholic Church now think it as great a heresy to appeal to antiquity as to appeal to Scripture, they have cause for surmising which way the victory has gone' (p. 29).

Dr. Salmon then proceeds to examine and analyse Cardinal Newman's theory of development as a method of escape from the adverse testimony of ancient Christendom, and shows with much logical acuteness how fundamentally it is opposed, not only to the view previously current, but to the decree of the Council of Trent on the decisive authority of

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Hæreses*, iii. 2.

the co  
For if  
is a p  
the o  
put o  
recall  
first a  
fulness  
with  
celebr  
dwelt  
Catho  
tant o  
thing  
now f  
and  
own o  
T  
that i  
plaus  
needs  
be sa  
viewe  
Cardi  
to be  
that t  
the g  
the g  
has r  
is doi  
very  
were  
that  
Leo'  
In  
argu  
judg  
traste  
is a  
accep  
privat  
each  
And  
prose  
conve

the consent of the Fathers in the interpretation of Scripture. For if development means anything, it means that theology is a progressive science, in which the latest authorities, not the oldest ones, are the best, so that the Fathers ought to be put on the shelf as antiquated and obsolete. He then aptly recalls the forgotten fact that when this particular theory was first applied to the religious question, it was alleged in all its fulness on the Protestant side by Jurieu in his controversy with Bossuet, whose horror at it took shape in much of his celebrated work on the *Variations of Protestants*, wherein he dwelt on the unchanging texture of the Faith, as held by Catholics, in contrast with the incessant shifting of Protestant opinions. And it is, as Dr. Salmon adds, 'a very serious thing if the leading authorities in the Roman Church have now to own that, in the main point at issue between Bossuet and Jurieu, the Calvinist minister was in the right and their own champion in the wrong' (p. 35).

There is the further awkwardness about development, that it is a double-edged weapon, and can be used quite as plausibly on the Protestant side of the debate, so that it must needs be reinforced by the tenet of Infallibility before it can be safely utilized by Roman Catholics; for if the matter be viewed as a scientific question (and that is in fact the way Cardinal Newman has invited us to view it), there is more to be said for the genesis of Protestant developments, seeing that they are of such a nature as to be possible only through the gradual development of the human intellect itself, and the growth of science and learning. And thus Infallibility has now to do all the work singly, but part of the work it is doing is to promote infidelity on a large scale, for 'it is a very short way from the doctrine that Pius IX. and Leo XIII. were as much inspired as Peter and Paul, to the doctrine that Peter and Paul were no more inspired than Pius or Leo' (p. 43).

In fact, Dr. Salmon argues, the whole Ultramontane argument revolves in a vicious circle. Alleging that private judgment and trust in the Infallibility of the Church are contrasted positions, they overlook the fact that private judgment is a necessity from which escape is impossible, and that acceptance of the doctrine of Infallibility is itself an act of private judgment, which is the sole and ultimate warrant to each person for the truth of that or any other proposition. And it is to this very private judgment that Roman Catholic proselytizers invariably appeal when endeavouring to make converts, calling on those they address to declare all their

former instructors in the wrong, and the religion they have hitherto professed erroneous. If you go as they urge, you do it as an act of private judgment; if you elect to stay where you are, that is equally an act of private judgment, and no distinction can be drawn between the cases; so that the same rule of logic applies to Roman Catholics also, who are acting as truly on their private judgment in remaining where they are as they would do if changing their religion.

Nor is the analogy drawn from civil life applicable here, that a sensible man will consult a lawyer, or a physician, and the like, on points where he feels his own ignorance and need of guidance. For the motive in such cases is belief in the superior technical knowledge and ability of the professional adviser; but our submission to the Pope is not demanded on any such grounds, but on that of his official position alone, so that the most learned are as much bound as the most ignorant to defer to his judgment.

After disposing of the more popular attempts of Roman controversialists to make it appear that there is unerring certitude to be attained, Dr. Salmon addresses himself to the more subtle line of argument in Cardinal Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, pointing out that what that work actually does is to give a history of the process by which men arrive at their beliefs, but it does not answer the question, How shall men secure that their beliefs shall be correct? In fact it brings into clear relief the truth that argument plays a very small part in the formation of men's creeds and opinions, which are much more largely due to authority or sympathy, in short, to environment. But we have usually to test and verify our beliefs, either by our own experience, or by accepting that of the generality of persons, since we know that, if the given point were not true, some contradiction of it would be forthcoming, the matter would be argued out, and either disproved or reaffirmed more certainly. But an infallible Church allows of no such re-examination and discussion, and is like a despotic country, where no public denial of anything the Government wishes believed is permitted, so that there is less chance of reasonable certainty there than elsewhere, if certainty is to rest on knowledge and argument, and not on the 'illative sense' which Cardinal Newman invented as their substitute, but whose existence he has so far not demonstrated. Practical certainty, in short, exists only for those things wherein our judgment agrees with that of all other men, because the things themselves are plain and self-evident to them. But the very fact that so many millions of Chris-

tians  
Infa  
kind  
coul  
one  
half  
outw  
anal  
cisiv  
but

thre  
Lore  
may  
that  
mus  
man  
axio  
emp  
sing  
perf  
Boss  
trea  
auth  
of th  
de P  
that  
in h  
class  
Ore  
Cath  
Wha  
Mar  
mon  
com

very  
tene  
for  
and  
tene  
carn  
are  
and  
emin



tians, Oriental and Protestant, exist who do not recognize the Infallibility of the Roman Church proves that certainty of this kind and degree is unattainable on that head; for the matter could not have been left by Christ so doubtful that more than one half of Christendom should reject it, and more than one half of those who nominally accept it should merely submit outwardly, with no inward conviction of its truth. This analysis of the *Grammar of Assent* is throughout keenly incisive, and leaves none of its ingenious sophisms unpierced; but we cannot dwell longer upon it.

Two lectures are devoted to an examination of Milner's three axioms in his *End of Religious Controversy*—that our Lord left a rule or method by which the religion He established may be found with certainty by all who seek it sincerely; that this method must be secure and never-failing; that it must be universal, adapted to the needs of the great bulk of mankind. And it is shown that whatever the truth of these axioms may be in themselves, they cannot be successfully employed to prove that the Roman Church, or the Pope singly, is the appointed guide away from all error and into perfect truth. Dr. Salmon illustrates this by again referring to Bossuet's *Variations of Protestants* as the ablest controversial treatise of its day on the Roman side; that Bossuet is also the author of the principal treatise against the Ultramontane view of the Papal prerogative—he means the *Defensio Declarationis de Potestate Ecclesiastica, quam sanxit Clerus Gallicanus*—and that the Roman Church has so varied from herself as she was in his time, that for his authorship of this work he has been classed by Cardinal Manning with heretics in general, and by Orestes Brownson, in *Brownson's Review*—the chief Roman Catholic literary organ in America—with Devil-worshippers. What security, then, asks Dr. Salmon, is there that Cardinal Manning, voicing the popular Roman opinions of the present moment, may not be served the same way in time to come?

More level to the understanding of ordinary folk are two very shrewd points which he makes: that the number of tenets which are declared by Roman teachers to be necessary for all Christians to know and believe explicitly are so few and brief that an infallible guide is not wanted; and that the tenets in question—the Divine Unity, the Trinity, the Incarnation and the Atonement, and the Judgment to come—are held by Protestants just as firmly as by Roman Catholics; and that the defence set up when it is shown that certain eminent Fathers did not believe, and directly contradicted,



various Roman tenets—namely, that they were innocent in so doing, because these tenets had not been defined in their time, but they doubtless would have believed them if they had been then defined—simply comes to this, that the Church, instead of making salvation easier, makes it harder by each new definition, stopping up thereby a road to heaven previously open, and barred now only because some speculative theologians happen to start new problems, about which the Church might quite reasonably have been silent. Another equally acute remark is that if, in Milner's axioms, we substitute the word 'sin' for 'error,' we might fairly enough think that God would have provided means to banish sin from the world—at any rate, from the Church; for the Scripture promises are fuller and clearer as to the leading of her members into holiness than into truth itself. But that frightful moral corruption has at times overflowed the Church, and the Pope also, is openly confessed by even the Ultramontane historian Baronius. And thus we have to ask if God hates error so much more than He does sin, that He must have taken precautions to exclude the one which He manifestly has not taken to exclude the other. We can see that He has dealt with both in the same way, by sending His Holy Spirit to enlighten both our understandings and our wills, and giving us the Scriptures as our guide into wisdom, the Church as a guardian and teacher of truth and morals.

How the Church discharges this teaching office is the next question Dr. Salmon sets himself to inquire. That we all require teachers is indisputable, seeing that we come into the world totally ignorant; but it is not necessary that our teachers should be infallible, though it is necessary that we should begin by accepting their instructions with deference and submission, thus growing by degrees able to pass an independent judgment on the statements propounded to us. There is no reason for supposing that the laws which govern the communication of religious knowledge differ from those which apply to all other branches of study. In both cases teachers are needed, and teaching which will submit to correction, and so improve, and thus foster human progress. This function has been on the whole effectively discharged by the Christian Church, both in respect of providing a body of teachers and improving her methods of instruction, as by the formulation of creeds. But to admit so much does not at all carry with it the corollary of infallibility in this office. The Christian teacher is not like the captain of a ship dealing with passengers, whom he does not instruct in navigation, nor

like a  
from r  
injure  
tions g  
medic  
as wel  
not by  
asserti  
them  
Salmo  
ancien  
moted  
stom's  
able t  
alread  
put be

Ne  
contra  
tersely  
formu  
the R  
Trent,  
ordina  
wise p  
Script  
Christ  
of his  
forbid  
Dr. Sa  
the R  
impos  
nally  
allege  
were c  
when  
she pr  
extrem  
unfitti  
condit

Ho  
devote  
trustw  
teachi  
negati  
Fathe

like a physician treating a patient, whom he would even deter from reading medical books, lest he should confuse and even injure himself through being tempted to disregard the directions given him. The likeness is rather that of a lecturer in medicine to a body of students, whom it is his object to make as well acquainted with the subject as he is himself, and that not by requiring them to take his statements on his mere assertion, but by pointing them to the best books, and giving them experimental proofs in matters admitting of it. Dr. Salmon illustrates this by showing the manner in which the ancient Church, even in the days long before printing, promoted Bible reading amongst all classes, and how St. Chrysostom's sermons presuppose a congregation interested in and able to follow an exposition of the Bible, verse by verse, as already familiar with the text upon which the gloss is being put before them.

Next he deals with the Church's sources of proof, and contrasts the teaching of the Church of England thereon—tersely worded by Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel, in the formula, 'The Church to teach, the Scriptures to prove'—with the Roman doctrine laid down by a decree of the Council of Trent, that written books and unwritten traditions are co-ordinate and equal records of saving truth. But this in no wise practically means that a Roman Catholic is free to use Scripture and tradition as means for ascertaining what is Christian truth. He must take that solely upon the assertion of his Church, which offers him no proofs, and virtually forbids him to look for them himself, even in these two records. Dr. Salmon then proceeds to vindicate the Anglican against the Roman principle by showing that a new tradition is an impossibility, and thus that the Roman Church, starting originally with the Scriptures only as its title-deeds, fell back on alleged tradition when non-Scriptural practices or tenets of hers were challenged, and has now called in the aid of Infallibility when defied to point out the record of the tradition to which she professed to make appeal. And he further points out the extreme uncertainty of such tradition as is producible, quite unfitting it for use as proof in the manner required by the conditions of the problem.

He enlarges this part of the discussion in the lecture devoted to the Rule of Faith, wherein he asks if there be any trustworthy source of information besides Scripture as to the teaching of our Lord and the Apostles, and answers it in the negative, showing that such was also the teaching of the Fathers, though they recognize the place of tradition in the

inferior sense of the recorded continuance of Church usages, rites, and customs, acquiring authority and prescription in virtue of their long prevalence. There is a full and scholarly inquiry into the apparent contradiction to this low estimate of tradition amongst the Fathers which is found in Tertullian's treatise *De Præscriptione*, wherein appeal is made to tradition against the Gnostics. This, Dr. Salmon shows, is entirely due to the attitude taken up by the Gnostics of that day, who rejected the evidence of Scripture—the Old Testament totally, ascribing it to an evil god; the New Testament practically, supplementing it wherever it did not accord with their views by the means of alleged secret traditions in their possession concerning our Lord and His Apostles. To this claim Tertullian opposes the testimony of the Churches of apostolical foundation, as being certain to have any genuine traditions of the sort preserved amongst them, and he also denies the right of the Gnostics to use the Scriptures at all, because those Scriptures had been given, not to them, but to those Churches whose unanimous teaching they rejected. That unanimous teaching is the tradition entitled to deference, but no other has the like claim. The value of this argument depends entirely upon the independent character of the testimony of these diverse and scattered Churches. But the like unanimity amongst the Churches in communion with Rome to-day has not similar evidential character; because they are all bound to submit to the Pope's decision, and thus are practically only one single witness, precisely as the agreement of all the copies of one edition of a printed book proves nothing, whereas that of a large number of manuscript copies made by several persons from the same original is of great weight in favour of the truth of the reading which all accept.

The function of tradition in the exegesis of Scripture is treated in a lecture by itself, and Dr. Salmon points out that, modest as the claim made for it in this wise appears in comparison with the co-ordinate rank also claimed for it, yet that in practice it may readily mean the same thing, since tradition can quite conceivably be so used as to supersede Scripture under colour of explaining it. But within its true sphere and range it may be a valuable aid in Biblical study. Negatively, its evidence is decisive against any new-fangled interpretations alleging themselves to be ancient, and is good ground of presumption against all novel interpretations, since the high probability is that a true gloss would not be so late in the field. As an example, Dr. Salmon cites the famous text,

'Thou  
which  
whole  
meanin  
have  
themse  
text an  
to St.  
histori  
since,  
and no  
tive u  
other  
the co  
enjoin  
been s  
as an  
any ti  
itself  
the pu  
ever-i  
becau  
delive

A  
is no  
woul  
quiry  
theles  
of Ro  
that I  
as sel  
centr  
religi  
fallib  
so th  
be so  
Salmo  
states  
which  
fallib  
cann  
charg  
right  
whic  
Infal

'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,' which modern Romanists allege to be the charter-text of the whole constitution of the Church. If such had been its meaning, the Apostles would have so understood it, would have taught it to their converts, and have acted on it themselves. But the great diversity of interpretation of this text among the Fathers, the majority of whom do not apply it to St. Peter, and none of them apply it to the Pope, shows that historical tradition excludes the Ultramontane interpretation, since, if primitive, it could not have been lost and forgotten, and not recovered for four or five centuries. Another negative use of tradition is in deciding the status of rites and other positive institutions. This Dr. Salmon illustrates by the ceremony of feet-washing, which our Lord seems to enjoin as a perpetual observance, but which in fact has not been so practised by the Church. Positively, tradition serves as an index of doctrine: that is to say, the use of a text at any time to prove a given doctrine, if not proving the doctrine itself true, yet does prove that those who alleged the text for the purpose believed the doctrine. This witness becomes of ever-increasing weight and value as we trace it further back, because we thus arrive so much the nearer to the teaching delivered by the Apostles.

After establishing in the earlier part of his work that there is no antecedent probability that an infallible guide in religion would be provided, he applies himself to the more limited inquiry whether facts are in favour of such a guide having nevertheless been granted to mankind, and then whether the Church of Rome is this guide. And he draws attention to the facts that Roman controversialists habitually take these two points as self-evident, making no attempt to prove them, and concentrating their labours on demonstrating the errors of other religious bodies, as proving that none of them can be the infallible guide which they assume to exist somewhere on earth, so that, by the process of exhaustion, none is left which can be so except the Church of Rome. To this proposition Dr. Salmon addresses himself, and proceeds to refute it. He states at the outset of his disproof the preliminary objection which may be taken to its legitimacy: that if the possible Infallibility of Rome is left an open question, her fallibility cannot be proved, because it may always be urged that in charging her with error, the accuser is wrong and she is in the right. He traverses this by appeal to the historical facts which show that Rome herself does not believe in her own Infallibility. And this he does by pointing out in the first

place that no claim to Infallibility, no definition of its extent and sphere, no specification of the place where it is lodged, is to be found till the Vatican decrees of 1870, a fact wholly incompatible with its having been a received article of belief binding upon Roman Catholics at any earlier date, whatever currency it might have had in the unofficial utterances of private theologians. Next, he reminds us of the reluctance habitually shown on the part of the Roman Church at large to invoke this means of deciding controversies within its pale, and what is even more noteworthy, the reluctance of the Popes themselves to exercise it.

For the interference of 'authority' to end a discussion may be of two wholly different kinds ; it may be the authority of superior knowledge, which is felt to be decisive, or it may be only the authority of official position, which may be erroneously wielded. There is no doubt whatever that the Pope does possess the authority of position in his Church, that he can coerce those who reject or oppose any decision of his. But is he held to possess the other and higher qualification of superior and unerring knowledge? This question can be answered by observing what is the usual conduct of those who appeal to authority of either kind to decide a disputed question. The intervention of the expert is welcomed and even solicited, and the fuller and more explicit the answer he gives, the better satisfied are those concerned to know the truth. But when official position interposes, those who think the decision likely to go against them deprecate action, they threaten refusal to accept the decision, and consequently much caution to avoid giving offence sufficient to provoke resistance is commonly exhibited by the authority thus menaced, which will endeavour to adopt a non-committal policy, and say as little as possible. But this is precisely what has customarily happened in the case of disputes within the Roman Church, and notably in the controversies on the Immaculate Conception of the B. V. M. and on the doctrine of grace.

Nor does the evidence for the practical disbelief of Infallibility end with cases of this sort, many as they are ; it has not ended even with the Vatican decree itself. For at this moment there is no authorized commentary on Scripture issued with the stamp of Infallibility to warrant it ; there is no similarly authorized and warranted catechism ; there is no guarantee for freedom from error in the case of the teaching of any of the hundreds of thousands of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in whose hands the instruction of virtually the entire Roman Catholic Church is vested ; the very Breviary itself

contain  
crediti  
for new  
each a  
speak,  
at any  
viously

Dr.  
just sp  
revelat  
manism  
cient t  
how th  
the bas  
Cathol  
given l  
the fals  
an alle  
truth o  
countin  
to this

So  
does no  
may re  
that it  
useless  
or to th  
in the  
justifie  
the blu  
are sele  
Sixtus  
case th  
inculpa  
wherein  
success  
the fait  
final de  
by the  
concert  
printed  
the pul  
for all  
Vatica  
Vatica

contains numerous records of miracles which need not be credited ; the revelations which are accounted sufficient ground for new cults and observances are not certified as true ; in each and all of these cases the infallible voice hesitates to speak, and leaves itself a way of escape, if it should be found at any time convenient to drop or to disavow something previously tolerated, if not actively encouraged.

Dr. Salmon enlarges upon one of the forms of reticence just specified, in a chapter dealing with the alleged divine revelations on which so considerable a part of modern Romanism is built, since even tradition has been found insufficient to meet the craving for religious novelties. He shows how the doctrine of Purgatory rests almost exclusively upon the basis of such revelations, and yet that it is open to Roman Catholics to disbelieve any or all of them, while no help is given by the Pope to enable them to distinguish the true from the false, since even the canonization of the recipient of such an alleged oracle does not carry with it a decision on the truth of the oracle itself. This shaft is driven home by recounting the stories of La Salette and Lourdes, which even to this hour have not received the seal of Papal ratification.

So far, then, it is demonstrated that the infallible voice does not intervene to protect the Church from errors which may result from hysteria, delusion, ignorance, or fraud, and that it is thus practically useless as a safeguard, whether that uselessness be due to negligence in exerting its prerogative, or to the lack of any such prerogative at all. The next step in the inquiry is to show which of these alternatives we are justified in adopting, and this is done in a lecture on some of the blunders of the infallible guide. Two salient instances are selected : the edition of the Vulgate published in 1590 by Sixtus V., and the condemnation of Galileo. In the former case the direct and capital responsibility of the Pope for the inculcated book is established by reference to his own preface, wherein he explains that in virtue of his singular privilege as successor of St. Peter, empowering him to confirm others in the faith by reason of his own unfailling faith, he had given his final decision upon every one of the readings submitted to him by the committee of learned revisers with whom he worked in concert ; he had personally examined every sheet as it was printed, and corrected it with his own hand ; he prefixed to the published volume a constitution declaring it authoritative for all time, forbidding its being printed anywhere save at the Vatican Press for ten years, and then only from one of the Vatican copies, and also forbidding the publication of any



various readings in copies of the Vulgate, or any deviation from the text as now issued; further declaring all readings in other editions or manuscripts of the Vulgate differing from the Sixtine edition, of no credit or authority. Any disobedience to this Constitution should incur the Divine anger and that of SS. Peter and Paul, and further incur the greater excommunication, capable of absolution by the Pope alone. The errors with which this edition absolutely swarmed were speedily detected, and the Pope's death in August 1590, soon after its publication, made its withdrawal and suppression feasible, while care was taken to lay the blame on the printers, and a new edition, differing from the Sixtine in more than two thousand places, was issued in 1592 as the authentic one by Pope Clement VIII.

The condemnation of Galileo is detailed more fully than this episode, and care is taken to expose the shifts with which it has been minimised and even defended. An excellent specimen of these is to be met with in the allegation that the condemnation of Galileo is without the customary clause of Papal condemnation at the end, so that the Pope's responsibility for it may be doubted, if not denied! But Galileo was condemned in 1616, while the earliest known employment of this 'customary clause' is dated January 17, 1729.

Having thus fully disposed of the claim of the Pope to be regarded as the channel of Infallibility, Dr. Salmon proceeds to examine the more plausible Gallican theory, which accounts the dispersive Church as the sphere of its existence, and he shows what are the great practical difficulties in the way of accepting this as a satisfactory solution of the problem. Chief amongst these difficulties is that the meaning of the phrase 'consent of the dispersive Church' is that the judgment wherein the large majority at any given time have agreed, and which has come to be the general belief, is right; but this provides no tribunal whatever to decide during the actual prevalence of the controversies thus ultimately settled; it throws its light upon the past alone, not upon the present or the future.

A short sketch of the history of Gallicanism is introduced at this point, but we may pass it over, except so far as respects the four specific propositions which differentiate Gallicanism from Ultramontaniam, and which may fitly be recapitulated here. They are these: (1) The power possessed by Peter and his successors was over things spiritual only, not over things temporal. (2) The Pope is inferior to a General Council. (3) Papal authority must be exercised only in



accordance with the canons in use throughout the Church:  
(4) The Pope cannot make his decrees binding without the consent of the Church.

We are inclined to take some exception to Dr. Salmon's criticism on the famous Vincentian canon—'Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus'—that it is of no help in a controversy, because a controversy can arise only in just those matters which are not held *ab omnibus*, and both disputants are certain to claim *semper* as making for them. For, if he will reconsider the matter, he may note that the definition is almost the precise equivalent of that of common law in the civil sphere. For by common law are denoted all those legal maxims, customs, and observances which, ascending higher than record or memory (*semper*), have not been formally created and enacted by the legislature, but have acquired legal force by prescription and general prevalence (*ubique*) and consent (*ab omnibus*); and, though exception might be taken to all three factors in this definition, yet trifling or local deviations from the general reception of common law usages neither invalidate the common law abstractly, nor impede its habitual operation as an integral part of English jurisprudence. And similarly, the Vincentian canon, if not exhaustive (which no one alleges it to be), yet does much towards clearing the ground and narrowing the debateable area; by shutting out recent, local, and infrequent doctrines and usages from the category of those which are binding upon Christians. In point of fact, Dr. Salmon practically appeals to this very canon himself several times in the course of his lectures, whenever he adduces as arguments against some peculiarity of Romanism that (a) it can be shown to be of relatively modern introduction; (b) that it has never been received in the East; (c) that the considerable numbers who reject it disprove its claim to universal acceptance.

But we go with him when he urges as a further objection to the Gallican theory of Infallibility lodging in the dispersive Church, its being practically equivalent to the tenet that the large majority at any time must be in the right, that numbers are the test of truth—where we may interject the remark that Vincentius's *semper* and *ubique* safely condition and restrict this *omnibus*, which fails if taken alone, and so prove to be very useful factors in the definition of which they make two-thirds.

Reverting to the working of the principle of development in the modern Roman Church, Dr. Salmon points out that it involves complete abandonment of tradition, and ought logic-

ally to involve also abandonment of respect for the Fathers—nay, for the Scriptures also :

‘The Fathers may have been but children, but the Apostles were only infants. They lived when the Church had but just come into being, and before it had learnt all that the Holy Spirit has taught it in the course of nineteen centuries. If so, it ought to be only for curiosity that we need look into books written in the very infancy of the Church ; and to seek for our system of Christian doctrine in the Bible would be as absurd as to try to learn the differential calculus from the writings of Archimedes. In other words, the theory of development, as taught by Cardinal Newman, substantially abandons the claims of Christianity to be regarded as a supernatural revelation which is likely to be preserved in most purity by those who lived nearest to the times when it was given’ (p. 271).

This is a very acute piece of dialectic, and unassailable on the score of either legitimacy or cogency.

But is there no truth in the view that the Church was meant to grow in wisdom and knowledge in the course of ages ? Is Christianity alone amongst the subjects of intellectual consciousness doomed to permanent unprogressiveness, being able to dwindle and decay, but not to expand and germinate ? Has development no place whatever in its system ?

Certainly it has a place, Dr. Salmon replies—

‘There is such a thing as a real development of Christian doctrine. We acknowledge that all the precious truth of Scripture does not lie on the surface, and that continuous study applied to the Bible by holy men who have sought for the aid of God’s Spirit does elicit much that might have escaped a hasty reader, but which, when once pointed out, remains for the instruction of future generations. But we draw a distinction between things essential to salvation and things true, but not necessary. The way of salvation does not alter from age to age ; those truths which were effectual for the salvation of souls in the second or third century are sufficient for salvation still. . . . Again, there is a development of Christian doctrine due to the increase of human philosophy and learning. It is impossible to prevent these from playing their part in modifying our way of understanding the Bible. For instance, in the case that has already come before us, that of Galileo, we see that the progress of astronomical knowledge not only modified the manner in which texts of Scripture were understood which seemed to teach the immobility of the earth, but also made Christians understand that God, who does not work miracles to do for men what He intended them to learn to do for themselves, did not mean the Bible as a supernatural revelation of the truths of astronomy or other sciences, but left the attainment of knowledge of this kind to stimulate and reward the exercise of man’s natural powers’ (p. 271).

The confession that the Church of one age may be wiser

on several points than the Church of a preceding age involves, Dr. Salmon urges, the breakdown of the Gallican theory of Infallibility; because, if it be once admitted that mistakes and consequent uncertainty on important points of doctrine may prevail for a considerable time, it does not by any means follow that the moment the majority of Christians become agreed about them, a conclusion is thereupon reached which may not be subsequently called in question. Why should it not be challenged and set aside, if the Church has in the meantime become wiser?

For if God admittedly can leave many of His people for a considerable time imperfectly informed and even in error upon certain doctrines, what improbability is there that He may have left a whole generation in this condition, and reserved the perception of the complete truth for their successors? And in reference to the view that Infallibility cannot be exercised by the dispersive Church just now, because it is broken into three main fragments, having no intercommunion with each other, but that the power would revive could they be united again, Dr. Salmon puts in the demurrer that it is antecedently more probable that the gift of Infallibility was never bestowed upon the Church, than that, having been once bestowed, it should have been thrown into abeyance for more than twelve hundred years; and he concedes that Roman controversialists are right in holding that, if this gift was in fact once conferred, it is likely that the Church still exercises it. But one of his own statements, to which we have already referred, weakens the force of this objection—namely, that all necessary saving truth was made known early, and all truth since disclosed to or discovered by the Church is merely secondary and subordinate; for, if that be so (and we agree that it is), infallibility would be of the first importance for the definition of indispensable truth, but by no means so for the acquisition of minor truths, left to the normal operation of the intellectual powers to investigate and record without the aid of revelation.

Two lectures deal with the once widely prevalent, but now vanishing, theory that the Infallibility of the Church is vested in General Councils, and Dr. Salmon, after a preliminary apology for being obliged to speak unpleasant truths concerning assemblies entitled on the whole to the gratitude and respect of Christians, remarks that the principal value of the Councils to us is their historical attestation of the doctrine of the Church in their day; the Nicene Council, for example, in the very act of refusing to listen to the letters of Arius, proving

beyond dispute that the denial of the co-eternity of our Lord with the Father was held at the beginning of the fourth century to be an offensive novelty. But the vicissitudes of the Arian controversy for nearly a century after Nicæa had spoken, the resistance with which its decrees were received by a large fragment of Christendom, establish that even this Council, the highest of all in repute and dignity, was not accounted infallible by the Church of its own time, and that its decisions obtained their ultimate victory, not on the ground of the authority of the deciding synod, but on that of their own inherent truth, on the validity of the proofs tendered as their evidence. And if this be the case in respect of the Council of Nice, much more does it hold good of the remaining Œcumenical Councils, none of which stands so high upon all grounds, and more than one of which was attended with discreditable violence, and with all the marks of partisan rancour. The inquiry is carried down to the great Western Synods of the fifteenth century, and the same marks of fallibility are shown to apply to them all. We are bound to say, from independent examination of synodical history, that Dr. Salmon has by no means overstated the case, and that he is quite justified in the use he makes of Cardinal Newman's corroborative language. He turns the tables very neatly upon the Cardinal, however, in the following paragraph :

'In everything I have thus far said to discredit the authority of Councils, I am, as my quotations from Cardinal Newman will have told you, in full agreement with modern Roman Catholics, who think that when they have shown that Infallibility does not reside in Councils, they have gone very near to prove that it does rest with the Pope. Now, if a tradesman has taken pains to produce a belief that his rival in business is little better than a bankrupt, it would be thought strange if he tried to get his bills cashed on the strength of having his rival's endorsement, yet this was exactly what Pius IX. tried to do when he attempted to have his claim to infallibility endorsed by the Vatican Council' (p. 317).

He disposes of this assembly itself in a few sentences which vigorously and fairly sum up the flaws which vitiated its proceedings morally and legally, winning for it the title of '*Ludibrium Vaticanum*,' which brackets it for all time with the '*Latrocinium Ephesinum*.' Trite as the story is, these blemishes may well be once more recited, for though the Council is past, the evil it has done still abides with us. First, there were three hundred bishops in the assembly who were mere titulars, representing no real Churches, and so incapable of attesting any local tradition. The Bishops who did repre-

sent genuine flocks were swamped not only by these titulars, but by the overwhelming disproportion of the Italian and Sicilian prelates, illiterate almost to a man. Twelve millions of German Catholics were represented at the Council by fourteen bishops; seven hundred thousand inhabitants of the Papal States by sixty-two; three bishops of the minority—those of Paris, Cologne, and Cambrai, represented five millions of Catholics, and could of course be outvoted by any four of the titulars or of the prelates of the minutely divided dioceses of Naples and Sicily. All the management of the Council was in the hands of a committee appointed by the Ultramontane faction, upon which no bishop of the minority sat, and without whose consent no subject could be discussed. The acoustic properties of the place of assembly were so bad that nothing could be intelligently heard at first, and very little to the end, even after some remedy had been applied; and as there was no permission granted to have the speeches printed, no subsequent information as to what had actually been said was accessible to the members. Nay, more, the notes which were taken down and drafted into a *précis* were kept exclusively in the hands of an infallibilist committee, which did not permit any speaker to see them for the purpose of correcting the report of his words, which might be (and probably were) distorted and caricatured, if contrary to the wishes and designs of the majority, before being submitted to the committee. Three hundred of the bishops were actually the Pope's pensioners during the Council, all their expenses being defrayed by him, and it was thoroughly well understood that they were expected to give value for cash received; besides that fifteen vacant cardinals' hats were dangled before the eyes of all the prelates, and the Pope himself was not ashamed to ask, more or less directly, for a decision in favour of the new dogma upon which he had set his heart. And, to end the miserable story, the closure was introduced to stop the mouths of the anti-infallibilists, who could at once be silenced on the demand of any ten bishops to end the debate; and the summer heats of malarial Rome brought fever into the ranks of the northern bishops, who were compelled to escape to save their lives, though it was possible for the seasoned Italians to hold out with impunity. Dr. Salmon appears to think that the reason why, at the final stage of the proceedings, all the anti-infallibilists save two had run away, is because the refugees were not prepared to humiliate themselves by publicly declaring, as they would have been called on to do, that they believed *ex animo* the very tenet against which they

had voted *non placet* immediately before. He does not add what was publicly alleged at the time, and with every mark of probability, that the Pope, being at that date still king in Rome, was prepared to use his dungeons for the reception and coercion of obstinate opponents of the new dogma. It may be that they were entirely wrong in entertaining such fears; it is matter of fact that they did entertain them. No heavier indictment of the Council is needed.

Clearly then, even if it had been true in the past that Infallibility vested in the Councils, this last of the large assemblies is so thoroughly discredited by the whole course of its proceedings, that instead of strengthening the cause for which it was convened and manipulated, it furnishes an additional argument of a cogent kind against that cause, as needing such measures to secure its victory. There is no question at all that if Papal Infallibility had really made part of the known and received doctrine of the Roman Catholic world before 1870, and had been really believed by the Latin episcopate at large, the utmost freedom and impartiality in the conduct of the assembly would have been the wisest and safest policy; the spectacle of harmonious sessions and unanimous attestation would have vindicated the claim to the whole Roman Catholic communion, instead of branding it, as the policy actually pursued has done, as the product of fraud and violence.

Four lectures which follow upon this examination into the proceedings of the Councils are occupied with tracing the historical growth of the tenet of Papal Supremacy, and traverse ground which has been already covered in the pages of this Review. Accordingly, we shall not summarize them for our readers, contenting ourselves with indicating those passages only where new matter is adduced, or where we think some comment desirable. It may serve to exemplify the freedom from prepossession which marks Dr. Salmon's attitude throughout that he accepts the application of the word 'rock' to St. Peter, as the best explanation of the text St. Matt. xvi. 18, and though we are ourselves convinced that such is not the case, simply because that would violate the entire analogy of the Old Testament use of the epithet, yet we feel bound to mention not only the fact of his taking that view, but also that he supports it with no inconsiderable force of reasoning. On the other hand, he makes a strong point against the Ultramontane gloss upon St. Luke xxii. 32, by observing that not merely is the specific function of strengthening the brethren attributed in the Acts of the Apostles to St. Paul, to



Silas and Judas, and to Timothy (xiv. 22, xv. 32, 41, xviii. 23), but that St. Paul uses this identical word *στηρίξω* when speaking of the benefit he expected to confer upon the Roman Church by his visit: 'I long to see you that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end ye may be established.' — *εἰς τὸ στηρίχθηναι ὑμᾶς* (Rom. i. 11).

Dr. Salmon has done an unintentional injustice to a distinguished memory by ascribing that feeble compilation *Evidence for the Papacy* to the late Earl of Crawford, whereas the real author was his brother, the Hon. Colin Lindsay, an amiable gentleman, but far from equalling Lord Crawford in mental range or literary acquirements. We are at issue with Dr. Salmon again in his peremptory rejection of the view of Epiphanius, that something like a joint government over the Roman Church was exercised by SS. Peter and Paul, and that a similar condition of things existed in some other cities. We hold that this is no mere rash and untenable assertion of Epiphanius, but that it refers to a separate organization of the Jewish and Gentile Christians in those cities which had a mixed population, and where, quite apart from the disciplinary difficulties which we know to have made a division between these classes, the question of language in the conduct of Divine service probably had to be considered also, and would be most easily solved by establishing separate congregations, one with its Liturgy in Hebrew or Syriac, the other using the vernacular of the place, whether Greek or Latin. We fully grant that this is only a conjecture, but even on the theory that the sole foundation of the notion of a double episcopate is the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and that it is a fourth-century forgery, we require some reason for the forger having imported into his composition just such a statement as must have at once challenged contradiction, because notoriously opposed to the then universal law of diocesan authority. It was his obvious interest to make his story plausible, and not to create unnecessary difficulties by such a gratuitous challenge of contemporary usage and feeling, and therefore it is more probable, on the whole, that he was recording a genuine tradition.<sup>1</sup>

A point so neatly made that it merits citation, though we do not feel convinced of its entire cogency, is that the form of the oath imposed upon all Latin bishops at their consecration is evidence against the primitive character of the privileges now, and for a long time past, claimed for the Papacy. It

<sup>1</sup> For an argument against the testimony of Epiphanius, see *Church Quarterly Review*, xxvi. 316.



runs thus: 'The rights, privileges, and powers of the see of Peter I will, to the best of my ability, extend and promote.' That means, Dr. Salmon argues, a deliberate policy of usurpation, and that unless the many thousands of Roman bishops who have taken this oath since it was framed have failed to keep it, or have been unsuccessful in their efforts, the Pope must have acquired by this time a number of prerogatives which his predecessors did not originally possess, and that at the cost of the rightful owners, extruded to give him possession.

Referring once more to Cardinal Newman's essay on Development, and to the admissions therein that Papal authority grew, not being in primitive times what it afterwards became, he turns the tables effectually by taking an illustration from the history of the United States, and pointing out that while Americans must allow that England is the parent of their country, and was its sovereign for a considerable time, and may allow further that this sovereignty was on the whole beneficial in the earlier period of the settlements, yet the time came when English rule ceased to be useful or healthy, and was wisely and justly exchanged for a different system. Once grant development, and precisely this same argument is open to those who now repudiate the Roman claims. They may admit that Rome founded the Church of England, that Roman guidance and supervision was long advantageous, and yet that it has quite ceased to be so for a considerable period, and that the Papacy in its present form and aspect is a mischievous and belated survival. When he has occasion to discuss the canons of the Council of Sardica in 347, upon which the appellate jurisdiction of the Popes ultimately rests, Dr. Salmon, though referring to the objections taken in these pages to their genuineness, pronounces in their favour. He does not seem to know of a piece of evidence, not included in the hostile evidence tendered in this Review, which is conclusive against the canons, proving them a forgery. They were first alleged, it will be remembered, from Rome as though Nicene, by the Papal legate to the Church of Carthage in 419. The Carthaginians not only were quite unacquainted with them, but could find no trace of them in the archives of the Churches of Constantinople and Alexandria, to which application was made. It is of course just barely possible that the question put by the Carthaginian envoys who were appointed to make the search was only, 'Are these canons Nicene as alleged?' and that they did not put the more important question, 'Are any such canons, of any Council, in

your archives?' And therefore the failure to find them is not irrefutable proof that they could not have been found by careful search. But here is the fatal blot in the case for the canons: Gratus (or Aratus), Bishop of Carthage, was one of the prelates present at the Council of Sardica, and thus must have either brought the genuine canons back with him on his return, or would have had them sent to him, on the hypothesis that he quitted the Council before the close of the proceedings. And there were thirty-six other African bishops with him, whose signatures may be read in the 'Second Apology of St. Athanasius.' The question ceases to be longer arguable once that fact is adduced.

A lecture on the Pope's Infallibility cites the leading disproofs of it supplied by such examples as those of Popes Liberius, Zosimus, Vigilius, and Honorius, which need not be recapitulated. But there are some acute paragraphs on the attempts to evade such an issue by means of inventing conditions which are to be held essential to an *ex cathedra* pronouncement of the Pope, some of which are certain to be alleged lacking when any heretical or even simply erroneous ruling of a Pope has to be explained away and declared unofficial, as uttered only in his character of a private doctor, when even Ultramontanes allow that he is not infallible. Dr. Salmon gives the plain common-sense rule that we are bound to account as *ex cathedra* all spontaneous deliverances and all replies on doctrinal questions made by Popes to questions put to them in their official character, published by them, and recorded in writing. And he deals trenchantly with two further devices of apologists: that the Pope may err on matters of fact, though the conclusions he draws from the wrong premises, if affecting doctrine, will nevertheless be infallible; and that he may also err in the mere *obiter dicta* of a decision, while its main tenor is infallible. On this he observes:—

'This distinction prevails in our own law-courts. Though the judgment of a Court of Appeal binds inferior courts, yet if the judges in pronouncing sentence express an opinion on a subject not immediately before them, that goes for nothing, it being possible that if they had heard the question properly argued, they might have changed their sentiments. . . . It seems to me that the analogy to our law-courts does not hold. Judges who decide by human wisdom may go wrong for want of adequate use of human means to guide and inform their judgments. But if the Holy Spirit inspire the sentence, He cannot be supposed dependent on these human means; and if information is given which has not been asked for, this surely ought

to be attributed to the Holy Spirit's special direction, and to be received with all the more reverence' (p. 431).

And a little further on, discussing the definition given by the Vatican Council of an *ex cathedra* decision, that it must be a definition on faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, a limitation which Bellarmine had laid down already, he says :—

'Yet it is obviously a most unfair limitation to Papal infallibility to maintain that the appointed guide to Christians collectively is unable to conduct them safely if they consult him individually. Really believe that the Pope is an infallible guide, and nothing but the controversial exigency of relieving yourself from assent to certain erroneous Papal decisions could induce you to put such a limitation on the office entrusted to him by Christ. But further, this measure of relief to weak consciences is altogether too sweeping in its application. For over a thousand years of the Church's history no single decree of a Pope addressed to the Universal Church is known. The bull 'Unam Sanctam' of Pope Boniface VIII. in 1303 is the first addressed to the whole Church. I told you how a Jesuit writer regarded it as an unanswerable reply to Dr. Pusey's theory of infallibility, that his condition that the Church should be undivided makes it necessary to maintain that the gift has been dormant for the last 1,200 years—that is to say, for two-thirds of the lifetime of the Church. And surely the objection is just as fatal if it was for the first 1,200 years the gift was dormant, and if it were only in comparatively modern times that the Pope awoke to the exercise of his full powers' (p. 433).

The closing lecture of the series, entitled 'The Pope's Temporal Power,' is only partially concerned with that particular topic. It begins with mention of the two main divisions within the Ultramontane ranks themselves, that of 'Maximisers' and 'Minimisers,' and tells of the straits to which Dr. Newman was put, as a member of the latter group, when endeavouring to explain away or to persuade himself that he believed in some sense the monstrous propositions of that 'Syllabus of Errors' which Pius IX. in 1864 appended as a schedule to his Encyclical of that year known as 'Quanta Cura.' The Syllabus was in fact simply a body of extracts from previous allocutions of the Pope, and so, though his signature was not attached to it, and it was thus evaded as not being clothed with the attribute of infallibility in its collective character, there remained the difficulty of getting separately rid of the eighty articles of which it consisted. This Dr. Newman endeavoured to do by examining each condemnation separately, with a view of finding whether there were anything in the special occasion of its delivery

which might limit its application to some one particular case, and thus remove the obligation of regarding it as a general principle, meant to bind the Church Universal for all time. There is no reasonable doubt that this is precisely what Pius IX. meant them all to do, selecting them for that very end, and it was understood that if the Vatican Council had sat longer they were to have been included in its formal decrees.

Dr. Salmon points out that the Roman claims have grown chiefly out of two forgeries, the Pseudo-Clementines and the False Decretals, of the latter of which he proceeds to give an account, explaining how the Decretal system itself naturally arose, and fixing the date of the forgeries about 850, on the grounds that a Council of 845 is quoted in them, and that they themselves are cited in 857. He agrees with modern scholars in thinking Rheims rather than Mentz their place of origin, and that the chief object of the forger was not so much to exalt the prerogatives of the Pope directly as to throw difficulties in the way of deposing provincial bishops, by making the Pope and not the comprovincials the authority which alone could pass such a sentence. But the circumstance that the forgery did not originate in Rome, nor at the instance of the Pope, does not excuse the employment of them by Rome, directly till their falsity was exposed in the Reformation era by the Magdeburg Centuriators, and indirectly ever since by retaining in use unaltered all that vast mass of pontifical law which is based exclusively upon them. It is, as Dr. Salmon puts it, the case of a man who has not himself forged a cheque, but who presents one forged by some one else, and pockets the money. The question of the deposing power in its application not to bishops only but to kings also, is then reviewed, and a warning is interjected against the validity of a defence set up for it by some recent apologists, that it was derived from voluntary cession on the part of the nations concerned, feeling that they could trust the Pope's impartiality in judgment. For the claim is never urged by Popes themselves on any such ground; their attitude is that of supreme rulers of all society, exercising a Divine prerogative, and such acquiescence of nations in depositions of the kind as is actually verifiable does not point to that acquiescence being the source of the grant, but rather as constituting that happy condition of secular affairs which made it possible and safe for the Pope to exercise it. And appeal is made to documents issued by Gregory VII. and Boniface VIII. to prove that such is the true explanation. The closing pages of Dr. Salmon's work are occupied with

briefly telling how ill the Popes discharged this office, and how miserably misgoverned were the Papal States down to the deposition of Pius IX. from his rank of king. A few documents of the Vatican Council are printed as an Appendix.

There is one omission to which we must call attention, and which we trust may be made good in a future edition, that of a concluding lecture, supplying a working hypothesis to take the place of the several theories which have been successively examined and set aside as ultimately untenable. Especially having regard to the genesis of Dr. Salmon's volume, as addressed to a class of candidates for holy orders, a constructive portion should follow the destructive part; for the teacher of religion is even more bound to tell his hearers what they are to believe, and why they are to believe it, than to warn them against erroneous opinions or illegitimate arguments. As the book stands, those who adopt its principles are liable to be assailed from the Ultramontane side somehow thus:—

'You reject the Infallibility of the Church in all its forms, whether as vested in the Pope, in Councils, or in the dispositive Church. What have you to put in its stead? Unless there be some tribunal of appeal, some common arbiter, nothing remains possible as the alternative save the wildest licence and diversity of individual opinion, under which all the articles of Christian belief may disappear entirely, and must inevitably disappear for a considerable fraction of now professing Christians. There is no longer any ground upon which one person who can read, and who thinks he understands the meaning of Scripture, can have his position challenged, no matter how widely his conclusions may differ from the historical faith. No one can reasonably call on him to give up any of his views, and to substitute others for them; for if there is no Infallibility anywhere, why should he not think his own view as good as anyone else's, or as that of any aggregation of fallible persons, seeing that no increase in the mere numbers of erring mortals can make them unerring? Put our case, the case of the Roman Church, at its worst if it so please you, and yet you must confess that it has maintained all the articles of belief that made up the creed of Athanasius, of Augustine, of Chrysostom. It is matter disputable and disputed whether certain tenets we hold are novel, and even partly contradictory of those we hold in common with you; but it is not matter of dispute that we have maintained the great cardinal beliefs unaltered and unshaken—the Divine Unity in Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, and so forth.

Can so much be said for those who have abandoned the old landmarks, who belong to the societies engendered in the sixteenth century? Is it not notorious that a formidable proportion, if not a positive majority, of them have given up Christianity, nay, Theism itself? What have they left together of that Bible which you tender as being singly a sufficient guide to a true belief? You twit us with keeping it away from our people. But we have done so only to protect them and it from misuse, always probable, often inevitable. And we have always maintained its Divine origin, its inspiration, and its priceless spiritual value. But they have taken it away in the fullest sense, not only denying its inspiration, but not so much as allowing it credit as a mere secular record. So you Protestants have lost the Bible as well as the Church; or, to speak more truly, you have wantonly rebelled against the one, and have as wantonly decried and flung away the other. And the result is that you have no warrant for the truth of anything you still fancy you believe; you have no trustworthy answer to give to anyone who asks you What is truth? What ought I to believe?'

Now while it is perfectly true that an allocution like this swarms with fallacies, yet it is not every young student or every clergyman who could refute it, or would fail to be seriously impressed by it, if opportunely made. An experienced theologian could piece together Dr. Salmon's own view of the Rule of Faith out of detached phrases scattered throughout his course of lectures; but no mere student is competent for the analysis and synthesis required for the purpose. And therefore, we repeat, he should have ended the course with a constructive lecture, putting the case of an honest and intelligent inquirer, desirous of ascertaining which of the competing types of Christian doctrine and polity has most claims upon his deference, which is in nearest accord, externally and internally, with the teaching and practice of the Apostles. That he could do this, and do it well, no one who has studied his work on the New Testament will doubt. That his present work is incomplete and maimed till he does it, few who study it will doubt either. He has cleared the ground of piles of rubbish, ancient and modern; let him shew us what he can build upon the vacant site.



## ART. II.—CLARENDON'S HISTORY OF THE REBELLION.

*The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England begun in the year 1641.* By EDWARD, EARL OF CLARENDON. Re-edited from a fresh collation of the original MS. in the Bodleian Library, with Marginal Dates and Occasional Notes, by W. DUNN MACRAY, M.A., F.S.A., in six volumes. (Oxford, 1888.)

MR. MACRAY has done good service in producing a nearly perfect edition of a book which has, and which will continue to have, as great an interest for the general reader of English classics as for the student of seventeenth-century history. We can now follow in his own language the pen of the real Edward Hyde through its stately task from 'Silly, March 18, 1645,' to 'Jarsy,' and from 'Jarsy' onwards down to the last date in his second exile, 'Montpelier, August 1, 1670,' which are the concluding words of the MS. and of Mr. Macray's edition. The earlier editions of the *History of the Rebellion* have all been, for one reason or other, unsatisfactory. The standard one hitherto has been that known as Dr. Bandinel's, the edition namely of 1826, which was slightly corrected and revised in 1849. But this edition wants the valuable dates in the margin which Mr. Macray has so industriously collected, and the supplying of which really represents the greatest part of his labour. This edition contains, however, a set of notes by Bishop Warburton, which Mr. Macray has considered it better to omit, as being 'sufficiently placed on record by their double publication' (Preface, p. viii). These notes, to which some further reference will be made later on, are more valuable perhaps as reflecting the mind of Bishop Warburton than in elucidating Lord Clarendon; as when, for instance, on the mention by Clarendon of the 'Presbyterian spirit' (bk. x. 103), the pious bishop calmly remarks, 'The worst spirit on this side H——.' These notes came into Dr. Bandinel's possession in a curious way. While his edition was preparing for the press he heard from the then Dean of Worcester that a copy of an earlier edition was in the college library there, and that it had notes in Warburton's handwriting. These he transcribed, and the transcript may still be seen in his own hand on the Bodleian copy of the edition of 1826, on which copy also appears the evidence of the first scientific collation of the MS., for Bandinel has inserted on the margin in red



ink the actual words of the MS. wherever they differ from the text as printed in that and the earlier editions. But even he did this imperfectly, and Mr. Macray has done it all over again with an accuracy which it would be as impious to doubt as it would be laborious to verify. Labour, however, is the order of the day—minute, accurate bibliographical and textual corrections and notices. To such an extent is this pushed in some departments of literature that one is inclined to think that readers were made for books, not books for readers; and that entirely objectionable person mentioned above, the general reader, may sometimes be tempted to sigh for the shrewd, if often inaccurate, generalities of the Macaulayan age of historical literature. But the student will and can only be grateful.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Macray has tabulated at the end of volume vi. all the passages which in the MS. differ from the text as printed in the edition of 1849—in other words, of the omissions and errors of his predecessor in the task—and as this table extends over 55 pages it is tolerably manifest that Dr. Bandinel did not in any degree reach the standard of textual criticism of the present day. The corrections are in some cases somewhat trivial, as, i. par. 62, 'respect to the exercise' for 'respect of the exercise,' or the omission of an 'and' here and there. More interesting by far are such corrections as the restoration of archaic words for their modern substitutes: 'exemplar' for 'exemplary,' i. 163 and ii. 24; 'immergent' for 'emergent,' iii. 158; 'crazed' for 'crazy,' iii. 180; and one or two which actually had been misread by the doctor from Clarendon's crabbed MS., as 'amazing' for 'amusing,' iv. 96; 'irrevocably' for 'irrecoverably,' v. 289; 'Monroe' for 'Montrose,' vii. 365; 'unsociable' for 'miserable,' i. 163. Hyde almost always wrote Catholics when he meant Catholics; but earlier editors, and Dr. Bandinel in particular, would insert the word 'Roman.'<sup>2</sup> The true reading has now been restored, and we thereby learn a thing that we sometimes need to be reminded of, that in that age the staunchest of English Churchmen was not ashamed to call himself a Protestant. Deliberate carelessness in the collation

<sup>1</sup> It has been pointed out since Mr. Macray's edition was published that there are two wrong dates given. In ii. 30 the date of Essex's entering Brunswick should be April 2, not April 12; and on the next page but two (ii. 36) 'about April 30' should be 'about April 26.' Besides a slip to be mentioned presently about Williams, there are a few *errata* in the index, as under 'Jermyn,' x. 175 ought to be x. 176; and the reference to Macchiavelli (x. 168) should be x. 169. 'These are slight errors indeed in an edition of such a book.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Macray tells us in his Preface that it was Sancroft who suggested the substitution of the word 'Papists' for 'Catholiques.' We can well believe it.

by Dr. Bandinel is rare ; but there is an instance where, following the earlier editions, he promotes Antrim to a marquissate before his time (viii. 278). More doubtful, we think, are Mr. Macray's restoration of the old spellings of such well-known places as Plimmoth and Exciter, though perhaps Fayrefax for Fairfax is legitimate. But then why not Foscue (vi. 297) for Fortescue? Mr. Macray prints it Fo[rte]scue. It shows us the old pronunciation. Cirencester is always Ciceter or Cis-citer ; but in the index it appears under the form now being impressed upon the youthful rustic by modern Board schools, and hissed out with hideous emphasis on all four syllables by railway porters at Kemble Junction. So Newport Pannell is spelt in the old way in the text (vii. 288), but in the index appears in the modern form. Besides this table of corrected readings Mr. Macray is careful to give in footnotes the substance of the text as it appeared in the original editions, carefully placing each opposite the context, and thus giving us also, from the two MSS. from which the book was drafted, the corrections made by Clarendon himself in his second exile, as well as the corrections subsequently made by his sons in order not to offend the feelings of any descendants of the principal actors in the war who might be living. That the author himself doubted whether it might be advisable to publish the MS. for many years to come, is best seen from a passage in the ninth book (ix. 3), in which he says : 'If there ever be a fit season for such a communication, *which is not like to be in the present age.*' There is no doubt, by the way, that it was in consequence of this passage, as well as in consequence of the instructions left in Clarendon's will, that his sons who edited the first edition transgressed his command, elsewhere expressed, that the work should be published as it stood, and made some slight alterations and omissions ; their father's will had directed them to consult Sancroft and Bishop Morley as to the suppression or publication of his other MSS., and they extended this to include the MS. of the *History*.

The dates and places at which the various portions of the work were written have been placed by Mr. Macray in a note at the commencement of each book, but it is from a passage in the epistle dedicatory to Charles II. of the author's *Survey of the Errors contained in Mr. Hobbes' Leviathan* that we learn that the work was begun at the express desire of Charles I. 'As soon as I had finished (as far as I am able without the supply of those memorials and records which are fit to be examined into), a work at least recommended if not enjoined to me by your blessed father and approved and in

some degree perused by your majesty.' The italics are our own. One can fancy the degree of attention which Charles II. gave (to the State documents in bk. v. for instance) in the intervals of the tennis-court and Mrs. Lucy Walters.

Lastly, Mr. Macray has wisely reprinted the preface to the first volume, and the dedications to Queen Anne prefixed to the second and third volumes of the original folio edition of 1702-3-4. We think it is a pity that he has not also reprinted the grant by Anne of the copyright to the University of Oxford for fourteen years, 'whereof let the Master Wardens and Company of Stationers in our City of London take notice, 24th June 1703.' Thereby hangs a tale, for it is a common belief in that ancient seat of learning that the perpetual and sole right of reprinting Clarendon's *History* in any shape whatever is for ever vested in the University. The Copyright Act was not passed until 8 Anne, and, though the book has been so frequently reprinted within the period since elapsed that the benefit of that Act is secured to each successive edition, there is, of course, nothing to prevent a man from reprinting one of the earlier editions whose copyright has expired.

This preface and these dedications, however, are of great interest. This is not the place to revive a defunct controversy with Mr. Oldmixon, who accused the publishers of the book of forgeries, interpolations, and omissions without end. Mr. Macray has no doubt that the story rests upon no foundation; he has also no doubt that not Dean Aldrich, as once supposed (who was not born till 1647), but Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, the second son of Clarendon, was substantially (with some help from his elder brother) the author of the Introduction and Dedication. He quotes in support of this view (Preface, p. ix) several letters of incontestable authority. The authors, whoever they are, say that the work was 'solemnly left with them to be published, whenever it should be published, as it was delivered to them' (p. xviii). And therefore it cannot be doubted that they were false to their trust in the few slight omissions and suppressions which they thought good to make; that in substance they transgressed the motto prefixed incessantly by Clarendon to everything historical which he wrote: 'Ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat' (Cicero, *De Oratore*, ii. 15). Whether he himself lived up to this standard is quite another matter and does not affect their case. That Henry, Earl of Clarendon, was tender of his father's memory may be seen in an amusing passage in the life of Mr. Anthony à

Wood, Tory and Antiquarian (Wood's *Life by Himself*, Oxford, 1772, p. 394). In 1695 the poor man was fined, at the instance of the peer, 34*l.*, in the Vice-Chancellor's Court for inserting in *Athenæ Oxonienses* (p. 220) two passages to the effect that after the Restoration David Jenkyns expected to be made a judge, 'and so he might have been if he had given money to the then Lord Chancellor'; and again (p. 269), that Glynne was made 'the King's eldest serjeant-at-law by the corrupt dealing of the then Lord Chancellor.' Wood's countercharge against the Earl of falsifying MS. papers of his father, whereon the accusation had been founded, fell to the ground.

Two passages from this Introduction we cannot forbear quoting; one because it reflects to some extent upon English politics for all time, the other for its special application to Lord Clarendon's own fortune. The first is: 'There is a craft' (p. xxiii) 'and perpetual subtilty that men of private interest must work with, to support their own designs; but the true interest of the kingdom is the plainest thing in the world; it is what everybody in England finds and feels and knows to be right, and they are not long a finding it neither.' And the second: 'For whosoever' (p. xxviii) 'comes to the yoke of true and painful drudgery in his master's service, from that moment creates to himself so many industrious enemies, as he cannot gratify in all their several wild pretensions, to displace and destroy him.' 'Tempus erit' (say the authors of the Introduction, p. xxxvii) 'magno cum optaverit emptum Intactum Pallanta,' and no doubt there were times almost every day of his life when Charles II. wished he had protected his faithful servant more effectually. When they came to write the first dedication to Queen Anne, they found that, in spite of the lessons of the civil war, there had 'hitherto appeared few signs of repentance and reformation' (p. xlii). Else why (p. xliii):—

'these several seminaries and, as it were, Universities [the Nonconformist schools] set up in divers parts of the kingdom by more than ordinary industry, contrary to law, supported by large contributions; where the youth is bred up in principles directly contrary to monarchical and episcopal government? What can be the meaning of the constant solemnizing by some men [the mystical Calves' Head Club?] of that dismal Thirtieth of January in scandalous and opprobrious feasting and jesting,' &c.

The first edition (to which these Introductions appeared) is one of those ponderous sets of folios which struggle at the present day, like ancient spinsters, to preserve their figure

with only partial success, and which give us such a notion of the serious manner in which our ancestors took their literature. There were then no book-rests screwed on to easy-chairs, and no easy-chairs to screw them on. As in the famous German caricature of the 'Edition de Luxe,' the reader must either have sat upright at a large table, or lain upon his stomach on the floor to devour its pages. How eagerly, nevertheless, they must have been devoured by those squires of the October Club, 'fat with Devonshire or Staffordshire ale,' whose fathers had stood in the Red regiment at Edgehill beside the stainless Verney 'until their musketeers were driven in, and their pikemen charged in flank and rear by Balfour's and Stapleton's horse, and pressed hard in front by two regiments of foot,'<sup>1</sup> and the combat became a butchery. They had never seen it, but they had heard it at their widowed mothers' knees, and lo! here the story lived again for them in these wonderful pages. Perhaps they drank a health to the king over the water as the chaplain read to them (for we may imagine they preferred this method of imbibing knowledge to the more laborious one described above) the account of the last moments of the Blessed Martyr. And how fiercely they would swear that it was a false lie when he came to the account of Naseby, and read how 'the king's reserve of horse, which was his own guards, with himself in the head of them, were even ready to charge those horse who followed those of the left wing when on a sudden such a panic fear seized them that they all ran near a quarter of a mile without stopping' (ix. 40). Clarendon does not tell the story of the king riding along their ranks and saying 'One more charge, gentlemen,' and of their refusal.

This first edition is a marvel of beautiful printing. Each volume has the fine portrait of the author by Lely prefixed to it, and each book is headed with an initial letter of considerable beauty, and there are quaint allegorical tail-pieces of cupids and dragons, &c., in profusion. Moreover, to the Introduction and the Dedications are prefixed three extraordinary little engravings in the style of the period. In the first of these a crowned figure is presenting to one body of Roman senators on the right a key, to another body on the left a sceptre, while a city of towers and hills appears in the distance. The towers are the towers of Oxford, but the hills suggest 'nive candidum Soracte'; for surely Shotover was never so white. The meaning of the corresponding engraving in vol. ii. is more obvious. Clio presents the book to

<sup>1</sup> Gardiner, *Civil War*, vol. i. p. 57.

Queen Anne, who wears a pineapple on her head and sits beside a gigantic funeral urn. A kneeling maid holds up the ponderous folio, at which the queen points with a marshal's baton and a disdainful expression, as if she said 'That passage must be expunged,' while in the background Clio strikes an appropriate attitude and her lyre. The third of these productions is so allegorical or so meaningless that it seems not worth while to describe it. But curiously enough the Bodleian copy of this edition has been at some later date interleaved with French and Dutch full double-page plates representing scenes from the history. They are of very moderate merit, with the exception of one, the king taking leave of his children, by Roux, which is a fine composition. One of these plates, 'The Revolt of the Fleet,' by Bastin, in vol. iii., has appended to it the following explanation: 'N.B.—Considering the vast improvement in naval architecture, it was thought it would be most agreeable to represent the fleet as composed of modern ships; at top are several hieroglyphick figures' (apparently pouring the vials of their wrath upon the revolting fleet). None of these plates are dated but one, the battle of Naseby, by Parrocel, which is dated 1727. The 'Apotheosis of the Blessed Martyr' (in the background Whitehall and the execution) is in the very floridest style of half-naked angels and early Louis XV. All the little top-pieces and tail-pieces in this edition appear to be engravings on metal, probably copper, and all bear the signature M. B., that is to say M. Burghers, who designed and engraved many of the curious headings to the old Oxford Almanacks about that period, and who began his career as the pupil of Loggan, the designer and engraver of *Oxonia Illustrata*.

Next in order comes the only translation (French), so far as we know, of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, a beautiful little octavo edition printed at the Hague, and running from 1704 to 1709. This marks the early date at which the importance of the work was recognised. It is a question whether the University of that day would not have held the publication of such a translation a violation of their privileges if the book were sold in England, as no doubt it was, and at a much smaller cost than the folio edition. The Oxford edition of 1705 is rendered interesting from its having become the subject of interleaving upon the most gigantic scale known in the history of literature. In 1795 a well-known antiquary, Mr. A. Sutherland, began a collection of prints, portraits, water-colour drawings, engravings of medals, &c., to illustrate Clarendon and Burnet. After forty-two



years' labour, and an estimated expenditure of 20,000*l.*, his widow presented the Collection, bound in sixty-one elephant folio volumes, and enriched with over nineteen thousand illustrations of various kinds, to the Bodleian Library, where it at present remains. We say advisedly *at present*; for in order to meet the no doubt necessary changes in the management of that library which have taken place in recent years, it has been removed from its former resting-place to a room in the basement of the Old Schools Quadrangle (which one rather hopes than conjectures is dry enough for it). It has a good many of its backs cracked right through, while some of the volumes appear plentifully innocent of the dust brush. But old Spanish playing-cards, Red Indian picture books, and 'handbills, pamphlets, and printed matter, however trifling,' are reckoned far more worthy of attention in what was *once* one of the great libraries of Europe.

Another interesting copy of Clarendon in the Bodleian is one of the edition of 1707 in eight volumes, freely annotated in the handwriting of the celebrated antiquary, White Kennett. His notes differ materially from Warburton's in one respect, namely, that they give chapter and verse for everything that they quote. They are not criticisms of Clarendon's view or animadversions upon the persons concerned, as are those of Warburton (who firmly believed, by the way, in the adulterous connexion said to exist between the Queen and Jermyn, which Mr. Gardiner has happily exploded for ever), but are simply a set of illustrations and references to other books of great and real value to the student of the period. Kennett here and there points out an error, as when he calls attention to the fact that Clarendon calls Williams Archbishop of York at the time of Strafford's trial, whereas he was not made Archbishop till December 4, 1641. It is a pity that Mr. Macray (iii. 198) does not make a similar correction. Another curious note of Kennett's, and about the only one, unfortunately, for which he gives no authority, is to the effect that Speaker Lenthall had in 1659 a child baptized by an episcopal minister, to which Monk stood godfather. Kennett argues therefrom that Lenthall's affections were not averse to the Anglican Church. Was it not rather that the affections of that shrewd gentleman were not averse to the rising sun of whatever complexion it might be, and that he understood the signs of the times? One would be curious to know in what month of that eventful year the baptism took place.

It was not to be supposed that some attempts would not be made to violate the copyright of such an important book

as the *History of the Rebellion*. We find, accordingly, that there is an edition of 1717, printed in six volumes at Oxford, and frequently sold with eighty-five portraits—or less, according to the fancy of the Grangerite who has previously owned the copy—four large plates, and three maps, which plates, &c., are not the work of the University at all, but printed for a speculative publisher, one J. Nicholson of Little Britain, at the King's Arms. The unsuspecting buyer is surprised to find that the seventh volume is not part and parcel with the other six, but is entirely Nicholson's, and contains merely a few unimportant tracts, while the first six have been evidently rebound and had the plates inserted in them. The plates were originally in what now appears as vol. vii., then a separate book, and the original buyer was intended to incorporate them with the body of the work in their proper places, a table of reference being given. Many of the portraits are Vandyke's, one or two Antonio More's, and all of much more than average merit. The same cannot be said of the absurd picture of Charles II. riding in disguise before Mrs. Lane, nor of Vandergucht's 'Battle of Edgehill' (with cavaliers in the dress of William III.'s time). The well-known plan of the battle of Naseby, which reappears in Rushworth and in Sprigg, and which every visitor to that most interesting of battle-fields should take in his pocket, is reproduced here also. The maps are by Hermann Moll, geographer, but are too small to be of much interest. These, so far as we know, comprise all the editions to which any particular value is attached, with the exception of Dr. Bandinel's and the present one, which must of course supersede them all. The book has gone through almost as many editions as that which Frank Castlewood called the *Eikum Basilicum*, which ran through three before the end of 1648. (By the way, there was not a specimen of any one of these three in the Stuart Exhibition.) But one cannot help wishing that something could be done in the way of a fully annotated edition. Such would indeed be a stupendous labour, and would need an editor who possessed all the love and enthusiasm for his subject that inspires Mr. Macray, all his careful textual accuracy, and all Mr. Gardiner's knowledge of the period rolled into one. Mr. Gardiner's own work is, indeed, to some extent, as every history of the civil war must be, a running commentary on Clarendon, for whose work, in a memorable passage, he expresses a great admiration. 'Hyde, Capel, and Hopton,' says he 'represented the honourable royalism which stooped to no intrigue and would soil itself by no baseness,' ii. 496, and again ii. 498: 'Stranded

thus f  
endur  
found  
Atlant  
its sty  
as on  
on to  
thus l  
from  
testat  
docum  
when  
closel  
it is (I  
weigh  
him to  
of the  
from  
long t  
symp  
enlist  
man v  
delibe  
two c  
eviden  
Stubb  
histor  
struck  
speak  
seven  
perha  
justice  
upon  
the lif  
a wor  
follow  
'Th  
tion an  
of the  
other  
with th  
ment  
charac  
in earl

Mr. F

that for a time upon the beach of politics, Hyde could not endure to fold his hands idly. . . . The work, of which the foundations were thus laid within hearing of the plash of the Atlantic waves, was one day, through the stately dignity of its style and the life-like portrayal of character, to be reckoned as one of the masterpieces of English prose.' After going on to admit that accuracy was hardly to be expected in a man thus bereft of materials, he says, 'that Hyde did not depart from it willingly does not appear merely from his own protestation. When writing of the war itself he made use of the documents in his own possession, and it can be shown that when he founded his narrative upon them he adhered to them as closely as can be expected.' 'Instinct with party feeling' as it is (how could it be otherwise?), absent as is the 'ring of all weighing justice' from the exordium, Mr. Gardiner yet admits him to be an able follower of Hooker and a living exponent of the thought and feelings of his century. This is high praise from a historian, one of whose leading tasks has been for so long to struggle with Hyde's inaccuracies of detail, and whose sympathies are so markedly upon the Puritan side; sympathies enlisted, not by the writer's own descent from the greatest man who ever sat upon the throne of England, but from a deliberate conviction that Puritanism was the nobler of the two causes, after that lifelong and dispassionate weighing of evidence which has entitled him, in common with Bishop Stubbs alone of living Englishmen, to the title of a true historian. How differently from this calm judgment are we struck by the manner in which the late Mr. John Forster speaks of Clarendon. Mr. Forster was a real student of seventeenth-century history up to a certain point, and was perhaps the only man before Mr. Gardiner who did real justice to the character of Cromwell. Yet he made his essay upon Cromwell into a mere flail of Talus with which to thrash the life out of Clarendon and anyone else who dares to say a word for the Royalist cause. Witness such passages as the following:—

'The writers or politicians who want any precedent for the desertion and abuse of a great cause . . . must be satisfied with the study of the life of Hyde, which will show them, perhaps better than any other piece in history, how it is possible to act in intimate union with the principles and policy of a particular party at the commencement of a life, and to employ its close in steadily blackening the characters and opinions of the men with whom one has been acting in earlier days' (*Essays*, i. 278).

Mr. Forster will not permit any progress in political wisdom

—any changes of opinion. But it is a little ludicrous when in another passage in the same essay (i. 268) he calls Hyde the 'tempter of these men,' the men in question being Falkland and (!) Sir Edmund Verney.

Perhaps after all there is some truth in the theory that in history, as in everything else, the opinions of mankind move in a perpetual succession of waves of action and reaction. In the last century Clarendon was an idol aloft on a shrine, and few would have dared to impute to him wholesale or gross misstatements or misjudgments. The reaction in favour of parliamentary principles which was the consequence of the first Reform Bill—the reaction from Hume to Hallam—may be said to have lasted until the apparent discredit of those principles in our own day. During that period the *History of the Rebellion* was esteemed—and not by Mr. Forster alone—something below the level of a party pamphlet; and it is perhaps not altogether fanciful to connect that counter-reaction, which again leads writers to judge fairly of the Royalist cause, with that growing abhorrence of democracy and that revolt against the rule of the uneducated over the educated which is making itself felt to-day, no less than with a more thorough and competent sifting of original authorities. After all, it is difficult not to write history in a somewhat partisan spirit; and it is wholly impossible for a man with any imagination at all to avoid reading into what is written about such a period as this something of his own wishes or feelings. If a historian is not to point out to us which side is the nobler, if he is not to endeavour to train our minds to look for guidance in the present by his descriptions of the past, if he is not to tell us that Napoleon was a villain when he thinks so, his province will be narrowed until he sinks back into a more accurate but unspeakably duller variety of the strange beast known to the later middle ages as an 'annalist'; and we (the 'general reader' aforementioned) might as well expect to be elevated, in a sense other than dynamic, by reading a treatise on conic sections, as by reading one of those dismal productions, happily as yet few, which are, according to one view, to constitute history in the future. If Mnemosyne simply swallowed all the flame which she is currently reported to steal from the fire fountains of the past, like chimneys which consume their own smoke, instead of pouring it, with a diluting and mellowing hand indeed, into the brains of her worshippers in the present, she would be a useless kind of goddess, and worthy only of a place in the British Museum.

It is, in fact, absurd to try Clarendon by the standard of

present historical criticism : more absurd by far than to try Gibbon or Macaulay, Guizot or Carlyle ; yet how would any one of them stand the fiery test ? The fear of no *Church Quarterly Review* was before his eyes. To posterity he appeals in the opening sentences with an unbounded confidence.<sup>1</sup> And if ever there was a period in our history upon which party feeling might be excused for stretching its shadow far into the succeeding years, it is the period of the great civil war. All that was greatest and noblest in England was enlisted on one side or another. Here and there an Arundel might shirk out of the strife, and devote himself to collecting marbles in Italy. (How bitterly does the great Royalist historian denounce the contemptible attitude of Arundel, and how mean does he make his character appear, both before and after : ' He resorted sometimes to the Court, because there only was a greater man than himself ; and went thither the seldomer because there was a greater man than himself,' i. 118 ; ' He had no other affection for the nation or the kingdom, than as he had a great share in it, in which, like the great Leviathan, he might sport himself ; from which he withdrew himself as soon as he discerned the repose thereof was like to be disturbed,' i. 119.) Here and there a Newcastle might throw up the sponge in the middle of the fray. Here and there, too, in some ranks of society there was great apathy, as was natural in a people pre-eminently lovers of peace and indifferent to principles ; as, for instance, vi. 269, where Clarendon says of Cheshire and Lancashire : ' And it fared in those counties that the number of those who desired to sit still was greater than of those who desired to engage of either party, so that they were generally inclined to articles of neutrality.' But this was not at the beginning of the war the spirit of the true leaders on either side. Their spirit was more akin to Strafford's own, in which he wrote to Northumberland, ' we must all give our all to the cause.' It was not, indeed, Strafford's cause which had to be supported in 1642 and 1643 by either party. His cause—a lost one in England almost before it was born—we had rather not say too much about. But the cause for which Falkland fell and Hyde diplomated was a twofold one, first in substance the struggle for the law as it stood, against a new and arbitrary power,

<sup>1</sup> It is curious that even Mr. Gardiner is capable of trifling errors ; in the passage already quoted (ii. 479) he says that Mr. Macray has restored the true reading of these opening sentences—' Though for no other reason yet lest posterity,' &c. Mr. Macray has *not* restored this, because Clarendon erased it and began again ' That posterity,' &c. And in the original manuscript the first erased word is *if, not though*.

and second, as Mr. Gardiner has well pointed out, the revolt of the intellectual minority against the domination of a narrow unintellectual creed. It matters little to us whether this twofold cause, or the simpler one of which Strafford dreamed, was uppermost in the King's mind. So many things were at various times uppermost in that royal head that it is impossible to say at any given time that it had any fixed resolve until the shadow of the axe had taught it that one duty was left, one path clear. That lesson at least it could learn and obey nobly. Never, too, was a war carried on upon either side with more enthusiasm, more heroic blundering, and, let us add for the honour of England (considering the horrors then being enacted on the Continent), with more humanity. Listen to the opinion of Colonel Andrew Newport, 'a Shropshire gentleman who served in the army of Gustavus Adolphus in Germany and in that of Charles I. in England' (and more than strongly suspected to be in reality no other than one Daniel Defoe of Cripplegate, London). He says (p. 229, ed. 1792):

'I believe I may challenge all the historians in Europe to tell me of any war in the world where, in the space of four years, there were so many pitched battles, sieges, fights, and skirmishes as in this war. We never encamped or entrenched, never fortified the avenues to our posts, or lay fenced with rivers and defiles. Here were no leaguers in the field, as at the story of Nuremburg; neither had our soldiers any tents, or what they call heavy baggage. It was the general maxim of this war, "Where is the enemy? Let us go and fight them!" or, on the other hand, if the enemy was coming, "What was to be done? Why, what should be done? Draw out into the field and fight them."'

Defoe is, of course, no contemporary authority, but Mr. Gardiner refers to this work with the highest encomium of its having caught the spirit of the time. We may, indeed, well be proud of our ancestors on either side in that struggle; and yet the strange thing that strikes one after a study of the period is that there were but few really great minds among them. They had every high and noble quality of heart, but when Strafford was gone they were one and all a trifle narrow. There was no Wallenstein among the soldiers, still less a Richelieu among the statesmen; there was not one '*esprit à qui Dieu n'a pas donné des bornes*.' The greatest of them all was a man who felt his way to power not for power's sake, and profoundly unconscious of the goal of the path he was treading. There would be truth in that apocryphal saying of Cromwell to Ireton, 'One never rises so high as when one

does  
Crom  
ceiv  
bur  
Crom  
Still  
cour  
forc  
Falk  
as M  
They  
had  
as o  
still  
on b  
I  
Rebe  
fell  
we  
and  
him  
the  
tary  
swa  
civil  
trust  
'We  
calci  
that  
need  
grun  
the  
cour  
Fran  
ever  
quee  
almo  
crow  
in xi  
deca  
cont  
plen  
suffe  
the  
on h



doesn't know where one is going,' if it had ever occurred to Cromwell to think about anything but the duty which he conceived to lie immediately in front of him. (By the way, Warburton, in a note to viii. 201, stupidly attributes this saying to Cromwell in conversation with Bellievre instead of Ireton.) Still one is tempted to wonder to find the destinies of such a country swayed at such a moment by men of such uncreative force as the Pym and Hampdens, the Manchesters and Falklands, the Ruperts and the Fairfaxes. Even in warfare, as Newport points out, they were wofully behind the age. They had, indeed, adopted the lighter musket which Gustavus had introduced in his Polish and German wars, but the pikes, as one may see from the plan of Naseby above referred to, still almost outnumbered the muskets, and the 'Verpflegung' on both sides was abominable to the last degree.

In this struggle the author of the *History of the Great Rebellion* played no small part. On him from the beginning fell the task of drawing up those lengthy State papers which we cannot reckon among his more felicitous compositions, and which make books iv. and v. such dreary reading. On him fell the harder task of keeping, as far as was possible in the distracted Court at Oxford, the balance between the military and the civil parties; in other words of preventing some swaggering Lunsford from jugulating that uncompromising civilian, Culpepper; harder still his lot when the king entrusted him with the care of the Prince of Wales on the 'Westerne business' in 1645, where he had to deal with recalcitrant Grenvilles and drunken disobedient Gorings, with that extremely tiresome matron the prince's nurse, who would needs have a small faction of her own, and with all the grumblings and discontents that inevitably follow hard upon the heels of a falling cause; but hardest of all while that little court was being driven from Silley to Jarsy, from Jarsy to France, from France to the Netherlands, crossed as he was at every turn by the wrong-headed interference of the Catholic queen-mother, anxious no doubt for her son's eternal weal, but almost equally anxious to get him restored to his temporal crown by the aid of the Pope (of whom there is a fine touch in xiv. 60, to the effect that he had 'grown old and was much decayed in his generosity'); crossed by Jermyn, who was well content with his present position, and who (x. 176) 'loved plenty so well that he would not be without it whatever others suffered who had been more acquainted with it'; crossed by the ever volatile and mercurial Digby, who had a new scheme on hand once a week, and who gave particular trouble by

trying to marry the young king to the Duchesse de Chastillon (xiv. 96) after in vain making love to her himself. There is not perhaps any more striking instance of Clarendon's fairness than in the character which he gives over and over again of 'this extraordinary person,' as he repeatedly calls him. Digby must have been from the beginning of things a thorn in Hyde's side of no common sharpness, yet there is no man after Falkland and Capel of whom a more attractive picture is presented. Digby, who almost risked his own life to save his enemy Strafford (iii. 139), the adviser of the fatal step of the accusation of the five members, who yet broke down in his own part in that dismal comedy (iv. 146 *sqq.*), 'the most universally odious man in the kingdom' (iv. 193), the hero of an adventurous expedition into Hull disguised as a Frenchman to attempt the virtue of Sir J. Hotham (v. 432 *sqq.*), the leader of what we may call the extreme right wing of the royalist party, not only in their hostility to Rupert and the thorough-going soldiers (viii. 168 and ix. 130), but most directly to the right centre, Hyde and his friends, in his wish of carrying the Prince of Wales to Ireland (x. 13) and then to France (x. 18 *sqq.*), is yet the man of whom such charming characters are given at iv. 127-8: 'He was equal to a very good part in the greatest affair, but the unfittest man alive to conduct it . . . of great eloquence and becomingness in his discourse . . . and of so universal a knowledge that he never wanted subject for a discourse. . . . Very few men of so great parts are upon all occasions more counsellable than he. But his fatal infirmity is that he too often considers difficult things very easy. . . . The King,' Clarendon adds with great truth, 'was the unfittest person alive to be served by such a counsellor, being too easily inclined to sudden enterprises, and as easily amazed when they are entered on;' and again at ix. 126: 'And the temper and constitution of his mind was so admirable that he was always more pleased and delighted that he had advanced so far, which he imputed to his virtue and conduct, than broken or dejected that his success was not answerable, which he still charged upon second causes, for which he could not be accountable;' and again x. 13: 'Who always concluded that that was fit to be done which his first thoughts suggested to him, and never doubted the execution of anything which he once thought fit to be attempted.' We have said that this character is the best given after that of Falkland and Capel; the former has, indeed, become one of the commonplaces of English literary beauty (vii. 217-234), ending with the touching words: 'and whosoever leads such a life need not care

upon  
is  
a m  
sha  
his  
con

and  
no  
pla  
pur  
Hu  
ton  
cou  
the  
har  
(ii.  
He  
pra  
whi  
ak  
wh  
say  
nat  
suc  
in  
the  
tati  
hat  
oth  
of  
per  
this

him  
of  
wic  
spo  
to l  
from  
dra  
acc  
spir  
ma  
into

upon how short a warning it be taken from him.' The other is less familiar but hardly less beautiful: 'In a word, he was a man that whoever shall after deserve best in this nation shall never think himself undervalued when he shall hear that his courage, virtue, and fidelity is laid in the balance with and compared to that of the Lord Capel' (xi. 267).

There is one set of men to whom our author is not fair, and to whom he makes no pretension of being so. We have no particularly good opinion of the Scottish nobles who played their part in the drama; most of them acted from purely selfish motives: Argyll, Rothes, Loudon, Balmerino, Huntly, and the ever shifty and treacherous Duke 'Hambleton,' as Clarendon calls him, were about as bad a lot as one could find; and these were of course the Scots with whom the author came into most frequent contact, but even this hardly entitles him to speak of the whole nation as 'vermin' (ii. 23) (this was altered into 'men' in the earlier editions). He hardly realizes that he is giving a free people the highest praise when in ii. 21 he speaks of 'the being denied somewhat which he [Lesley] had a mind to have, *which to that people was always the highest injury*.' His bitterness comes out further when in vii. 267, speaking of Vane's mission to Scotland, he says that Vane 'was chosen to cozen and deceive a whole nation which excelled in craft and dissembling, and did it successfully.' But he judges not quite so unfavourably when in ii. 6 he says that nation would have been loyal, but for the fact that 'their whole religion consisted in an entire detestation of Popery, in believing the Pope to be Antichrist, and hating perfectly the persons of all papists; and I doubt all others who did not hate them.' This was, indeed, one phase of the creed of covenanting Scotland, and Clarendon may perhaps be pardoned for not having been able to see through this phase into the immortal nobleness of the creed itself.

And then take the character which he drew of Cromwell himself. He had no insight into the half articulate workings of that true English heart, yet Cromwell is no monster of wickedness to him. The judgment will at its worst correspond favourably with that which Pym pronounced on Strafford to his face. It is impossible to give more than a few extracts from those sections 147-156 of the fifteenth book in which he draws him. 'Wickedness as great as his could never have accomplished those trophies, without the assistance of a great spirit, an admirable circumspection and sagacity, and a most magnanimous resolution' (147). How true is it that 'as he grew into place and authority, his parts seemed to be renewed, as if

he had concealed faculties until he had occasion to use them' (148). 'In all other matters, which did not concern the life of his jurisdiction, he seemed to have great reverence for the law, and rarely interposed between party and party' (151). 'But his greatness at home was but a shadow of the glory he had abroad. It was hard to discover which feared him most, France, Spain, or the Low Countries, where his friendship was current at the value he put upon it' (152). Clarendon's heart was right English too, and he would read over this passage doubtless with pleasure when he reflected on treaties of Dover and the like. Lastly (156) 'he was not a man of blood, and totally declined Macchiavel's method.' He 'would never consent' to a proposed general massacre of all the royal party. 'In a word, as he had all the wickednesses against which damnation is denounced and for which hell fire is prepared, so he had some virtues which have caused the memory of some men in all ages to be celebrated; and he will be looked upon by posterity as a brave bad man.' And we do not think that these virtues were to Clarendon mere Macchiavellian 'virtù.' Clarendon, it is true, was, as most statesmen of his age were, well read in his *Principe*, and in the earlier books especially we find many passages which suggest close comparisons with its author. Apart from such Italianisms as 'those who were willing to run his hopeful fortune' (i. 103), and the more direct translation two paragraphs on, 'opened the door for much applause to be the portion of a wise and provident minister' (i. 105),<sup>1</sup> we have the whole of sections 51 and 53 in book iii., which in setting forth the necessity of secrecy and independence in privy councillors reproduces very remarkably Macchiavelli's own views in chapters xxii. and xxiii. of the *Prince*; unless, indeed, section 53 is to be referred to an earlier English political philosopher whose own fortune at some parts of his life bore a striking resemblance to that of Clarendon, Sir John Fortescue. We think it not at all improbable that Clarendon had studied 'The Government of England.' Among the Macchiavellian reflections we may notice in v. 153, 'who ever considers that the nature of men, especially men in authority, is inclined rather to commit two errors than to retract one?' That he is not above the superstitions of his age may be seen from the extraordinary story told in i. 93 about the presentiment of the Countess of Buckingham of her son's death, though he refuses to see at the end of book v. (449) any omen, as many did, in the standard being blown down

<sup>1</sup> See *Principe*, cap. xxvi.

the evening it was set up at Nottingham.<sup>1</sup> The contempt of the lawyer for theology, of which he must have had a pretty strong dose from his master as well as from the godly ministers who preached before the House of Commons before he left it, is seen in his reference to the Synod of Dort (i. 143), 'which hath given the world so much occasion since for uncharitable disputations, which they were called together to prevent.'

As we are not in any way attempting a criticism of the *History* from a strictly historical point of view, it would be idle to point out the great number of manifest inaccuracies to be found in it. Mr. Gardiner has practically done this so far as his work has at present gone, and he has done it in the ablest possible manner. The most striking of these is of course the whole account of the Short Parliament, which is wrong from beginning to end, and which attributes the whole blame of its failure to Vane. It is interesting, however, to see that Warburton suspected the truth of the story, for he says in a note to ii. 79, 'Why was not Vane disgraced? Strafford hated him. Either he was protected by the queen, or he *had in fact acted by the express direction of the king.*' Mr. Gardiner is strongly of opinion that the latter is the true solution of the problem. It is curious, as Warburton points out, that when Clarendon is speaking of Buckingham (of whom he gives a fairer character than any other given until our own days) in i. 70, and says that 'his single misfortune was . . . that he never made a noble and a worthy friendship with a man so near his equal, that he would frankly advise him for his honour and true interest,' &c., he omits all mention of Bacon, who, though not noble in every sense, did give Buckingham much sound advice, and certainly was at one time his close friend. The accounts of the seizure at Holmby (x. 89) and of the king's attempted escape (xi. 194-98) differ materially from that given by Anthony à Wood in his *Fasti* (edn. 1721, pp. 80-2). Wood says that he had the first of these from Herbert, one of the grooms of the bedchamber, and expressly says that the king was glad to go, and 'was the merriest in the company,' which view has been adopted by later historians; and as regards the second Wood says that the king got on well with Hammond in the Isle of Wight 'until one day he peeped into his scrutore, for no good end as was supposed, which de-

<sup>1</sup> For a notice of this omen see that curious book Aubrey's *Miscellanies*, p. 39. 'Col. Sharrington Talbot was at Nottingham when K. Charles I. did set up his standard on the top of the tower there. He told me that the first night the wind blew it so that it hung down almost horizontal, which some did take to be an ill omen.'

terminated the king to attempt his escape.' When Clarendon, in xi. 214-16, tells us that the ambassador of the States-General, Pauw, who was sent to intercede for the life of the king, was denied an audience till after the tragedy was enacted, Mr. Macray notes (but does not quote his authority, which is apparently *Theatrum Tragicum Londini publice celebratum*, Amsterdam, 1649, p. 203) that Pauw and Joachim were admitted to an audience on January 29, but the paper they read was not considered till the next day, and not answered till February 3. But it is impossible, and would be idle, as we said above, to attempt here a systematic description of the leading errors in the book; and we must not be suspected of attempting to palliate those errors because we have rather tried to point out the beauties. It is perhaps in the little touches with which he sketches his characters that Clarendon's great merit lies. We have omitted to notice two of the neatest of these. Cottington's (xiii. 30): 'He was of an excellent humour and very easy to live with, and under a grave countenance covered the most of mirth and caused more than any man of the most pleasant disposition,' &c.; and Noy's: 'The court (i. 157) made no impression upon his manners: upon his mind it did' . . . , and he thought that he 'could not give a clearer testimony that his knowledge in the law was greater than all other men's, than by making that law which all other men believed not to be so.' The first part of this character reminds one of what Dr. Johnson said of Thurlow, that he 'was an oak in the courts but a willow at St. James's.' Or again, as regards Monk (xvi. 115), 'And it was the king's greatest happiness that Monk never had it in his purpose to serve him till it fell to be in his power, and indeed till he had nothing else in his power to do.' Some happy uses of words, now lost or changed in sense, which occur throughout the book make us feel that our language has not altered for the better since the seventeenth century; *e.g.*, such are 'likewise' in the sense of 'likely' (i. 34), 'melancholique' for 'obnoxious' (ii. 103), 'amuse' in the sense of 'deceive' (vii. 253), 'cozened' for 'cheated' (viii. 182) 'hared' for 'harried' (xvi. 11).

That Clarendon should be perfectly just to Charles I. is as unlikely as that he should be perfectly just to Cromwell. It must be remembered that the king, whose faults Mr. Gardiner has so judiciously exposed, had a great power of attaching people to him personally, and Hyde was probably almost as sincerely attached to his person as he afterwards became to his memory. Yet he does not spare his faults, and it is a shrewd criticism, which Mr. Gardiner can only endorse, that

he  
eno  
opin  
not  
fact  
Tri  
cha  
wro  
don  
hav  
ever  
end  
The  
Kin  
who  
neve  
the  
Brun  
Que  
face  
have  
he e  
irreg  
to th  
the  
idea  
prin  
of ro  
called

1. Pa
2. Th
3. Th

THE  
and s  
tioned  
VO



he 'had an excellent understanding but was not confident enough of it; which made him oftentimes change his own opinion for a worse and follow the advice of a man that did not judge so well as himself' (xi. 241). The king was, in fact, not unlike the gentleman of whom the late Master of Trinity is reported to have said, 'I have often known him change his opinion when he was right, never when he was wrong.' It was at least in an age of meaner men that Clarendon wrote: 'If he was without some parts and qualities which have made some kings great and happy, no other prince was ever unhappy who was possessed of half his virtues and endowments, and so much without any kind of vice' (xi. 243). The description of the search for the tomb of the 'White King' in St. George's Chapel is full of covert satire on those who could so soon forget their master. King Charles I. was never removed to Westminster. In 1813, on March 31, on the occasion of the interment of the Dowager Duchess of Brunswick, his coffin was discovered lying by the side of Queen Jane Seymour and King Henry VIII. The body and face of the king were entire, and a drop of blood is said to have fallen on Sir Henry Halford's hand from the neck as he endeavoured to raise the body. The axe had made an irregular fissure, and the head had apparently been re-united to the body with cement. Of the 'majestic Lord who broke the bonds of Rome' and embodied the whole feelings and ideas of the England of his day in one fat bad man only the principal bones and the skull were left. Another fat bad man of royal blood witnessed this unhallowed intrusion. He was called George.

---

### ART. III.—PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE SCOTTISH LITURGY.

1. *Pastoral Letter, addressed by the Bishops to the Presbyters of the Scottish Church.* (1889.)
2. *The Scottish Liturgy, as authorised for use.* Second Draft (1889.)
3. *The Scottish Guardian* for August 23, 1889.

THE Church in Scotland possesses claims upon the interest and sympathy of English churchmen which are not proportioned to its material and numerical strength. The unfinished

ing adherence to Church principles in times of the deepest gloom and depression, and the faith and patience shown during the active persecutions of the last century, cannot easily be forgotten. The Church's struggle for existence after its violent disestablishment and ruthless spoliation just two hundred years ago, its forcible repression under legal disabilities and harsh penal laws, its gradual revival of energy and emergence from obscurity, its development of synodical action, and its recent well-planned system of lay-representation in the organization of the financial Councils of the Church, afford valuable lessons which may with advantage be studied by churchmen south of the Tweed.

Another feature in the history of the Scottish Church that has naturally attracted the attention of English churchmen, is the maintenance of a distinctive Eucharistic Service, commonly known as the Scottish Communion Office. This Office is based on the corresponding service in the Scottish Book of Common Prayer of 1637 (commonly, though not very accurately, known as 'Archbishop Laud's Prayer Book'), the introduction of which into Scotland was made the occasion of the revolutionary outbreak that was destined to swell in dimensions, and by-and-by to overwhelm both the Church and the monarchy.

The Order of the Holy Communion in the Prayer Book of 1637 differed, as is well known, from the service in the then English Prayer Book, chiefly by its reverting, in some important particulars, to the form to be found in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., and by its manifesting the influence of that book even when it did not adopt its exact phraseology. After the disestablishment of the Scottish Church, consequent upon the Revolution of 1688, the influence of the liturgical studies of the English Non-jurors came to be felt among their friends in the North, and further changes were made in the Communion Office. We must not attempt to follow here the somewhat minute history of the successive alterations of the service.<sup>1</sup> It must suffice to say that the Scottish Communion Office, as now generally used, may be said to date from the edition of 1764, issued under the editorship of Bishops William Falconar and Robert Forbes. In what we may perhaps call the anaphoral portion, *i.e.* from the Offertory to the end (for the earlier part of the service was not printed), the Office as generally used to-day differs from the edition of 1764 in only

<sup>1</sup> These have been treated very fully in Dr. (now Bishop) Dowden's *Annotated Scottish Communion Office. An Historical Account of the Scottish and American Communion Offices*, 1884.

some few very trifling particulars.<sup>1</sup> It was in 1764 that the words of the Invocation in the Prayer of Consecration (to which we shall have again to refer) were changed from the words of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 (almost exactly transcribed from the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.)

'Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and of Thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.'

into the present form :—

'And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.'

At the same time the two bishops transposed the order of the three leading parts of the Prayer of Consecration. For, whereas in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1637 the arrangement was (1) the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, (2) the recital of the words of Institution, and (3) the Oblation, the Scottish revisers of 1764 (under the influence of the Greek Liturgies, of which they had made a special study) transposed the order so that it now stands : (2) the recital of the Institution, (3) the Oblation, (1) the Invocation. And this order of the parts was, at the instance of Bishop Seabury, adopted by the American Church, though, as is generally known, the phraseology of the Scottish Invocation was not followed. We call attention to the present order of the parts of the Prayer of Consecration, because it is an order which has often given rise to a sense of dissatisfaction, more especially among Englishmen who come to settle in Scotland. To persons accustomed to regard the Consecration as complete when the words of Institution have been duly recited, it has not unnaturally been felt as something awkward, and needing explanation, that, after the words 'This is my Body' and 'This is my Blood' have been pronounced, we should go on to pray that these 'creatures of Bread and Wine may become' the Body and Blood of Christ. We shall have occasion hereafter to refer

<sup>1</sup> For example, the currently used Office prints 'meekly kneeling upon your knees' at the end of the Short Exhortation, and changes the Words of Delivery from 'preserve thy soul and body' into 'preserve thy body and soul.' The other still less important differences are noted in Dowden's *Historical Account*, p. 99.

again to this feature of the Scottish Liturgy; and in the meantime it must suffice to observe that whatever be the value of the explanations that are put forward as a *rationale* of this arrangement, the arrangement itself has ample warrant in many of the Eastern Liturgies, and also is not without support from the Liturgies of the Hispano-Gallican family.

The Scottish Communion Office put out in 1764 by Bishops Falconar and Forbes at once superseded the forms previously in use, and seems to have been in sole possession for thirty-two years. The occasional variations that are to be found in some of the issues (such as that which was submitted by Bishop John Skinner to Bishop Horsley in 1792, just before the Bill for the repeal of the Penal Laws was introduced into the House of Lords) are of a trifling kind, and do not possess the slightest doctrinal significance.<sup>1</sup> Yet even these trifling changes seem to point to the fact that the edition of 1764 did not possess any exclusive authority. Nor do the records of the episcopal synods give any indication that that edition, or any other, received formal and express sanction. The Scottish Communion Office has again and again received sanction in varying terms in several editions of the Code of Canons; but if one were to be asked what book was referred to it would be impossible to answer with precision. Advantage of this vagueness was taken at various times, and editions have from time to time been issued by private persons under the name of the Scottish Communion Office, which varied considerably from one another, and from the form in more general use. Thus in 1796—only four years after Primus Skinner had exhibited to the English Bishops a particular form as *the* Scottish Communion Office—Bishop Abernethy-Drummond issued an edition varying in very important particulars from the commonly received recension. For example, the Prayer of Consecration opens with the words—‘All glory be to Thee, Almighty God, for creating man in Thine Own image, and graciously giving him the enjoyment of Paradise,’ &c. &c., and the words of Invocation give us the reading ‘may become the *spiritual* Body and Blood,’ &c. This edition was reissued in 1801, 1806, 1809, &c. Again, in 1849, Bishop Torry’s sanction was given to a volume entitled ‘The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of Scotland,’ which contained a Com-

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.* ‘Meekly kneeling upon your knees’ seems to have been already added to the Short Exhortation, and the Words of Delivery changed from ‘preserve thy soul and body’ into ‘preserve thy body and soul.’

munion Office also differing from the commonly received text. One rubric directs Reservation, another after the sermon enjoins that '*when the Holy Eucharist is celebrated the Minister shall dismiss the non-communicants in these or like words, Let those who are not to communicate now depart.*'

The *jus liturgicum* has been often claimed as a prerogative of the Episcopate; but in Scotland, in the absence of a clearly defined and legalized text of the Scottish Office, even Presbyters have taken on themselves to issue editions with rubrics of their own devising, and, sometimes, with a very wide variation from the commonly received text. One of the most remarkable of these is the edition issued by the late learned liturgist, Rev. George Hay Forbes (to whose private press at Burntisland students of Liturgies are indebted for the valuable edition of the Sarum Missal and the edition, still incomplete, of the Gallican Liturgies); while the edition of 1743, which is, substantially, the Office taken from Laud's Prayer-Book, with some transposition of the parts, was 're-printed and re-edited' as lately as 1883, and, if we are rightly informed, is actually used in more than one place of worship.

After these preliminary observations our readers will be in a better position to understand the portions of the recently issued *Pastoral Letter of the Scottish Bishops* which bear upon the Communion Office. It is now thirteen years since the General Synod of the Scottish Church was last convened; and for various reasons, which are referred to in another part of the 'Pastoral,' but with which we are not now immediately concerned, the Bishops have judged it wise to summon the General Synod in the year 1890. The revision of the Canons will be the main work of the Synod; and, referring to this, the 'Pastoral' (which, we may observe, is subscribed by all the seven Bishops) thus explains the wishes and proposals of the Episcopate:—

'The proposed revision of the Canons has also seemed to us to offer a fitting opportunity to rectify the singular anomaly that, while our Code permits, under certain conditions, the use of a particular form of service for the celebration of the Holy Communion, known as the Scottish Communion Office, there is no provision declaring what is the particular form of that Office intended. Publishers have issued from time to time editions that vary from one another not only in the rubrics, but also in the text. And, still more strange, even the matter common to the various editions in more general use cannot be shown to have ever received any formal Synodical sanction. Individual bishops of our Church have at different times, even within the present century, put forth editions which, though objected to and protested against by some, it would probably have been impossible

legally to interdict. Even individual presbyters have in recent times printed and used forms of service under the name of the Scottish Communion Office, which varied in very remarkable ways from the generally prevailing forms. It appeared to us as plainly a blot upon our Ecclesiastical Law that, while the Church of England has its "Sealed Books," the Church of Ireland its "Statutory Edition of the Book of Common Prayer," and the American Church its "Standard Copy," we in Scotland do not possess any synodically authorized form of our Scottish Liturgy.

'We have observed, with a sense of deep thankfulness to Almighty God, from whom cometh this and every good gift, that there has been manifested of recent years, on all sides, less of the spirit of party, and more of the spirit of tolerance and mutual love among all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. And it has seemed to us that, amid these happier conditions of our time, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit of Wisdom, it would be possible, while preserving with scrupulous fidelity every characteristic feature, and every doctrinal truth of the Scottish Office (as commonly used), to remove from it what we believe to have been the main cause of misunderstanding, and to add, together with necessary rubrics, some improvements and enrichments. If this could be successfully done, and the amended version fixed by Canon, we believe we might then proceed, without danger to the permanent peace and unity of the Church, to free the Scottish Communion Office from the unworthy restrictions of its present canonical *status*. This we desire as Bishops of the Church; and we desire it more especially for the sake of those who are restrained from adopting the Office by the present Canons, and who, we believe, would gladly welcome the Office in its revised form. But we wish it to be clearly understood that it is not proposed to interfere with now existing rights of congregations entitled to use the Scottish Office in its hitherto prevailing form.'

In the passage here cited the Bishops point to reasons why it seems to them expedient, not only to settle definitely the text of the permitted Scottish Office, but also, taking the text in common use as a basis, to make such changes as might tend to clear the Office from some of the main objections that have tended seriously to limit its use. And on this being done they further propose to free the Office (as revised and authorized) from what they designate as 'the unworthy restrictions of its present canonical *status*.'

It is right to explain that in the year 1863, in the heat of an exasperated Eucharistic controversy, a party triumph in the General Synod was taken advantage of to degrade the Scottish Office, which up to that date had by canon (xxi. of the Code of 1838) been declared to be 'the authorized service of the episcopal Church in the administration of that sacrament' (the Holy Communion), and 'to be held of *primary* authority in this Church.' And up to 1863 it was by the same

cano  
at th  
Offic  
tion  
Offic  
Com  
of th  
and  
Offic  
sync  
restr  
circu  
expe  
succ  
I  
the  
Epis  
wher  
doub  
their  
sion  
secre  
the p  
Serv  
illeg  
thus

'T  
disho  
legisla  
liturg  
abase  
who a  
every  
occasi  
deaco  
dioces  
now a  
injusti  
assem  
of the  
forms  
be ma  
and hi  
able a

T



canon further enjoined that at all consecrations of bishops and at the opening of all general synods the Scottish Communion Office should be used. It is not easy to imagine the indignation caused among those who habitually used and loved the Office when in 1863 it was enacted that the English Book of Common Prayer 'is, and shall be, held to be, *the* Service Book of this Church for *all* the purposes to which it is applicable,' and that, instead of the Scottish, the English Communion Office should be used at all consecrations, ordinations, and synods. Entirely in the same spirit were the newly-devised restrictions upon the spread of the national liturgy. The only circumstance that mitigated the sense of wrong was the relief experienced when it was found that its opponents had not succeeded in totally suppressing the Scottish Liturgy.

In 1884, on the occasion of the Seabury centenary, when the American bishops were formally received by the Scottish Episcopal Synod in the city of Aberdeen, close by the spot where Seabury had received the gift of the episcopate, it was doubtless a source of chagrin to both the Scottish bishops and their guests that, on that solemn and most interesting occasion the Eucharistic Service which had been used at the consecration of the first American bishop, and which had been the plastic influence in imparting to the American Communion Service its characteristic features, should be forbidden as illegal. Writing in 1884 the present Bishop of Edinburgh thus expressed himself:—

'There is no disguising the fact that the Synod of 1862-3 dishonoured and degraded the [Scottish] Office. The object of its legislation was beyond all question to check the spread of the national liturgy. But it went beyond this; it took upon it to discredit and abase the Scottish rite in a way very painful to the feelings of those who admire and love it. Will it be believed by strangers that from every dignified and stately function of the Church's worship on such occasions as the consecration of bishops, the ordering of priests and deacons, the gathering of the clergy, or of the bishops, at synods, diocesan, episcopal, or general, the Scottish Communion Office is now absolutely excluded? How long will Churchmen tolerate the injustice that refuses permission to the bishop and clergy of a diocese assembling for the solemn celebration of the Eucharist on the occasion of their annual synod to join, should they prefer it, in the primitive forms of devotion supplied by the Scottish rite? How long is it to be made impossible for the united wishes of the bishop of a diocese and his candidates for holy orders to have in this matter their reasonable and rightful gratification?'<sup>1</sup>

The Bishops in their *Pastoral Letter* express their desire

<sup>1</sup> *Historical Account*, &c., p. 22.

not for the restoration of the Scottish rite to the place of 'primary authority' which it formerly occupied, but simply that it should stand on a footing of exact equality with the English. But this, as it would seem, they consider cannot be done with safety to the peace of the Church without the removal from the Office of a term occurring in the Epiklesis, which, rightly or wrongly, has been the main cause of offence, and which must be regarded as an entire innovation, introduced into the Scottish Office, only in the latter half of the last century. But here it will be better for us to allow the Pastoral Letter to speak for itself. It will, however, we believe, be found convenient at this stage to place before the reader, in the first instance, the Epiklesis as it stands in the Communion Office, ordinarily used, together with that in the revised Liturgy, the draft of which has been now printed by the Bishops, and placed before their clergy.

*Edition 1764.*

And we most *The Invocation*,  
humbly beseech thee, O merciful  
Father, to hear us, and of thy  
almighty goodness vouchsafe to  
bless and sanctify, with thy word  
and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts  
and creatures of bread and wine,  
that they may become the Body  
and Blood of thy most dearly  
beloved Son.

*Draft as printed 1889.*

And we most *The Invocation*,  
humbly beseech thee, O merciful  
Father, to hear us, and of thy  
almighty goodness vouchsafe to  
bless and sanctify, with thy Holy  
Spirit, this Bread and this Cup,  
that they may be the Body and  
Blood of thy most dearly beloved  
Son, that so whosoever shall re-  
ceive the same may be sanctified  
both in soul and body, and pre-  
served unto everlasting life.

The Bishops in the 'Pastoral,' after referring to some of the proposed additions and liturgical enrichments (to which we shall presently draw attention) proceed as follows:—

'The question upon which a much greater divergence of opinion and sentiment exists is in regard to the proposed alteration in the words of the Invocation, as found in the texts generally used.

'We have deep sympathy with the sentiment that is reluctant, without adequate cause, to change any form of words long familiar to the worshipper, and more especially when round that form the most sacred associations cluster. And we entirely concur with those who consider that it would be infinitely better that the Scottish Communion Office should remain in its present subordinate position than that any truth of our religion should be obscured. But we, as bishops and chief pastors of the Church, hereby declare that the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist is clearly expressed in the form now submitted for your consideration, while in the spirit of Christian charity, though yielding no principle, we have endeavoured to remove the needless

offence caused by the introduction, in the latter half of the last century, of a word which experience has shown to be liable to grave misunderstanding.

'As is well known to enquirers, the word "become" in this place finds no precedent in any edition of the Scottish Communion Office before 1764, nor in the authorized Scottish Book of Common Prayer of 1637, nor in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. (the only English Prayer Book in which an express Invocation appears). The phrase "be unto us," which occurs in all of these liturgies, commended itself to some of our number, but, after much consideration and consultation with others, it was judged wiser to express the thought by restoring the word "be" (from the earlier Scottish forms) with the addition of the clause "that so whosoever shall receive the same," &c. Such a clause is an invariable feature of all the great liturgies of the Eastern Churches, and is in intention apparently equivalent to the "nobis" of the prevailing Canon of the Western Church. The mingling, without confusion, of Eastern and Western features is a characteristic of the Scottish Liturgy throughout; and the noble and harmonious result testifies to the unity of the spirit that pervades very diverse forms in the worship of the various branches of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

'Furthermore, while taking into careful consideration the very various forms of expression employed in the Invocation by ancient liturgies, Western as well as Eastern, we have looked constantly for guidance to the account of the Institution of the Eucharist preserved in the infallible record of the Gospel history. And we would point out that in the choice of the words "may be," we have aimed at coming as closely as a precatory form would admit, to the very word used by our Blessed Lord Himself. He did not say "This *has become*"—but "This *is*—My Body." And similarly we pray, not that the Bread and the Cup *may become*, but that they *may be* His Body and His Blood. In the selfsame sense, and in no other sense than that in which the Lord, in the night that He was betrayed, declared the Bread and the Cup *to be* His Body and His Blood, we pray that the Bread and the Cup *may be* His Body and His Blood.

'If, then, Brethren beloved, a candid and fair-minded examination of our work results in the acknowledgment that, while removing a stumbling-block of comparatively recent introduction, we have tampered in no degree with the truth of doctrine, it cannot but be hoped that the prospect of the extended use of so noble and beautiful a Liturgy will be taken by those who have been accustomed to use it as more than compensation for the loss of a familiar phrase.

'There can be little doubt that the strong objection (whether reasonable or otherwise) felt to the use of the one word "become" in the Invocation, has been the chief hindrance to the more general adoption of the Office.'

It will be seen that the question before the Bishops was not whether the word 'become' in this part of the service might not possibly be justified by the precedent of some

ancient liturgy, but whether, when its sense had been so gravely misunderstood, despite repeated explanations, as to cause, in many instances, an impenetrable barrier to the extended use of the Scottish Liturgy, they were not justified in reverting to the word 'be,' which occupied this place in the Laudian Liturgy of 1637, and in the Edwardine Liturgy of 1549.<sup>1</sup>

Thus far we have written with a view to make more intelligible the words of the Pastoral Letter, which when read by those unfamiliar with Scottish affairs, and, more particularly, with the history of the Scottish Church during the last fifty years, seem to need some elucidation. We now proceed to describe the Liturgy as proposed by the Bishops in the draft which has been laid, or is about to be laid, before the several Diocesan Synods, with a view of eliciting opinion before it is submitted (with emendations if needed) to the General Synod, which alone possesses the power of giving the service canonical authority.

And first it will be observed that the title, which was formerly *The Scottish Communion Office*<sup>2</sup> is changed into *The Scottish Liturgy*. 'Liturgy' is doubtless here used in its special technical sense; but the word has come to be so well established in our language in its wider sense, as equivalent, to a body of precomposed forms of prayer to be used in public worship, that we fear confusion may arise from its use.<sup>3</sup> 'Office' is certainly not a happily chosen word. In Scotland it appears for the first time applied to the

<sup>1</sup> It would be easy to confirm by an abundance of testimony the Bishops' views as to the fact of the offence given by the word 'become,' and as to the very common misapprehension of its sense. But we are unwilling to rake the embers of former controversies. It may perhaps suffice here to quote from the words of the Scottish judge, Lord Mackenzie, delivered in the Court of Session, March 3, 1849, in the case of Rev. Sir W. Dunbar, Bart., *versus* Bishop Skinner, D.D., of Aberdeen: 'I cannot overlook the circumstance that a large part of the episcopal world think that the Communion Service of the Scotch Episcopal Church teaches the doctrine of Transubstantiation.'

<sup>2</sup> Or *The Communion Office of the Church of Scotland*, or *The Communion Office for the use of the Church of Scotland*, or *The Scotch Communion Office in use in the Scotch Episcopal Church*, or *The Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion according to the use of the Church in Scotland*; for all these are to be found among the title-pages of various editions of the book.

<sup>3</sup> Our *Book of Common Prayer* seems to use the word in the popular sense. 'It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England ever since the first compiling of her *Publick Liturgy*,' &c. 'By what undue means . . . the use of the *Liturgy* . . . came to be discontinued,' &c; and it is found more than once again in the same sense in the 'Preface.'

servic  
sugg  
jurors  
techn  
Servic  
to th  
*Litur*  
*Chur*

T  
rubric  
of Sc  
Praye  
safeg  
and o  
with a  
parta  
signif  
a free  
The l  
a fail  
meet  
at the  
Presb  
&c.  
Engli  
1637  
far as

T  
versio  
with v  
in the  
the p  
saying  
minut  
ments  
all th  
gressi  
or to

16  
partly  
with O  
Taylor  
Euchar  
'...'  
Holy F  
Blood

service of the Holy Communion in 1724, and was probably suggested by the title of the service-book of the English Non-jurors which appeared in London in 1718.<sup>1</sup> As the stricter technical sense of 'Liturgy' is confined to the Eucharistic Service, so is the stricter technical sense of 'Office' confined to the daily service of the canonical hours. Would *The Liturgy of the Eucharist according to the use of the Scottish Church* be too cumbersome?

The prefatory rubrics are based on a comparison of the rubrics in the *Book of Common Prayer for the use of the Church of Scotland*, 1637, and those in our own *Book of Common Prayer*. The first of these, while still preserving a useful safeguard, employed in several large congregations at Easter and other greater festivals, brings the rubric into conformity with actual usage. It runs thus:—*So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion shall*, when so required, *signify their names*, &c. The last of the prefatory rubrics is a free adaptation of the rubric of 1637, and is as follows:—*The Holy Table, having at the Communion time a carpet and a fair white linen cloth upon it, with other decent furniture meet for the high mysteries there to be celebrated, shall stand at the uppermost part of the Chancel or Church. And the Presbyter standing at the Altar shall say the Lord's Prayer, &c.* It will be observed that both 'the north side' of the English Prayer Book and 'the north side or end' of that of 1637 are alike disregarded, and the position of the priest (so far as the rubric is concerned) declared indifferent.

The Ten Commandments are taken from the Prayer Book version (not as in 1637 from the A.V.) And the frequency with which both the English and Scottish Liturgies are used in the same church makes it certainly more convenient for the priest to be saved from the danger of tripping in the saying of two forms, much alike and yet marked by many minute differences. The rubric prefixed to the Commandments is adapted from Laud's Prayer Book: 'The people all the while kneeling and asking God mercy for the transgression of every duty therein, either according to the letter or to the spiritual import [mystical importance, 1637] of

<sup>1</sup> 'A Communion Office taken partly from primitive Liturgies and partly from the First English Reformed Common Prayer Book, together with Offices for Confirmation and the Visitation of the Sick.' Jeremy Taylor's *Collection of Offices* (1658) contained a service for the Holy Eucharist, in which, we may observe in passing, the Invocation ran '... may bless and sanctify these gifts, that this Bread *may become* the Holy Body of Christ (Amen), and this Chalice *may become* the life-giving Blood of Christ (Amen).'

each Commandment,' &c. The text of the Summary of the Law (which may be used as an alternative for the Ten Commandments) is now taken from S. Matt. xxii. 37-40, and is introduced by the words 'The Lord Jesus said.'

An entirely new feature of the draft Liturgy is the permission to use 'Lord, have mercy upon us,' 'Christ, have mercy upon us,' 'Lord, have mercy upon us,' as an alternative response to the Summary of the Law. The restoration of the ancient *Kyrie* to the opening of the Eucharistic service will be doubtless felt by many as a distinct liturgical gain. We next observe that both the *Collects for the Queen* are removed; and while the sovereign is prayed for, expressly and by name, in the 'Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church,' this change will probably be regretted by few.<sup>1</sup>

The Collect 'O Almighty Lord, and everlasting God, vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to direct, sanctify, and govern,' &c., has, in accordance with long traditional use, been retained here, but it may be questioned whether any Collect should take precedence of the Collect for the Day in this place.<sup>2</sup>

It may be convenient to notice here certain new Collects which are appended to the Liturgy with the rubrical direction *Collects which may be said, one or more, at the discretion of the Presbyter, after the Collect or Collects for the day.* The corresponding rubric in the Book of Common Prayer does not permit the use of the Collects there printed when there is a celebration. They may be used, according to the English rubric, in the Communion Service 'when there is no Communion,' i.e. when 'Table Prayers,' as they used to be called, are said. The Scottish Liturgy does not sanction 'Table Prayers,' either directly or indirectly, but permits the use of certain Collects in addition to the proper Collect or Collects of the day. It is scarcely likely that the Bishops had in view the scruples of those who attach importance, according to mediæval tradition, to the number of Collects being an *odd* number; but, at any rate, such punctilious persons may now gratify their fancy without any violation of their Church's law. The Collects which are appended to the Scottish Liturgy are six in number, three of them being also found in the Book of

<sup>1</sup> In the present Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland the Collect for the Queen is omitted 'when the Queen has been prayed for in any service used along with this Office.' The American Church has here no special prayer for the President.

<sup>2</sup> We observe that in the collation made by Bishop Horsley, and vouched for by Bishop John Skinner, this Collect is not to be found in this place.



Common Prayer (namely 'Assist us mercifully,' &c., 'Prevent us,' &c., and 'Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom,' &c.), and three of them taken now for the first time from ancient sources. They are as follows :—

'O Almighty Father, well-spring of life to all things that have being, from amid the unwearied praises of Cherubim and Seraphim who stand around thy throne of light which no man can approach unto, give ear, we humbly beseech thee, to the supplications of thy people who put their sure trust in thy mercy, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

'O Lord Jesus Christ, who saidst unto thine Apostles, Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you, regard not our sins, but the prayers of thy Church, and grant unto us that peace and unity which is agreeable to thy will, who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. *Amen.*

'O Lord Jesus Christ, before whose judgment-seat we must all appear and give account of the things done in the body, grant, we beseech thee, that when the books are opened in that day, the faces of thy servants may not be ashamed, through thy merits, O blessed Saviour, who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. *Amen.*'

The second of these Collects will at once be recognized as the Collect in the Canon of the Roman Mass which immediately follows the *Agnus Dei*. We observe, however, a change (perhaps not unjustifiable) in the rendering of the clause 'ne respicias peccata mea, sed *fidem Ecclesiae tuæ*.'<sup>1</sup>

The first Collect, which is certainly very noble, both in thought and form of expression, has a peculiar interest attaching to it. It is taken, as we are informed by the Bishops, 'from the *Book of Deer*'<sup>2</sup> (the solitary liturgical relic that has come down to us from the Celtic Church of Scotland). The original we transcribe, exactly as it stands, from the late Dr. John Stuart's fine edition of the MS., which now forms one of the treasures of the University Library at Cambridge :—

'Creator naturarum omnium deus et parens uniuersarum incelo et in terra originum has tremantis populi tui religiosas preces ex illo inaccessibilibus lucis trono tuo suscipe et inter thiruphin et zarahpin inde-

<sup>1</sup> This Collect does not appear in this place in the Sarum, York, or Bangor uses; but, as in many other points, the Hereford Missal here corresponds with the Roman in possessing it. See Maskell's *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England* (3rd edit.), p. 169. The solitary mediæval Missal of Scotland that has come down to us, the Arbuthnot Missal, does not contain the Collect.

<sup>2</sup> So called because the volume originally belonged to the monastic establishment at Deer in Aberdeenshire.

fessas circumstantium laudes exaudi spei nonambigue precatones.  
Pater noster.<sup>1</sup>

A close rendering would result in a shape too harsh and obscure for devotional use, but the English, as printed above, catches the spirit of the original.<sup>2</sup> Even as detached from its context the Collect is singularly beautiful, but its beauty was enhanced by its serving originally as an introduction to the Lord's Prayer—that prayer which 'we are *bold* to say,' the 'spei non ambiguae precatones.'<sup>3</sup>

The third of the new Collects is described as having been 'suggested by a passage in the *Altus*, attributed, not without probability, to St. Columba.' The work here referred to is certainly a very early specimen of Celtic-Latin poetry, and we see no sufficient reason why the common ascription of it to St. Columba need be rejected.<sup>4</sup> The stanza which has formed the basis for the Collect is as follows:—

'Stantes erimus pavidī  
Ante tribunal Domini;  
Reddemusque de omnibus  
Rationem effectibus,  
Videntes quoque posita  
Ante obtutus crimina  
Librosque conscientiae  
Patefactos in facie:  
In fletus amarissimos  
Ac singultus erumpemus,  
Subtracta necessariā  
Operandi materiā.'<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Book of Deer*, edited for the Spalding Club, p. 89. The liturgical portion is printed in Mr. Warren's *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, p. 160.

<sup>2</sup> The words 'in caelo et in terra' ought to be represented in the English, as bringing out more clearly the thought that the Cherubim and Seraphim and poor 'trembling' man are alike the 'offspring' (Acts xvii. 28) of God.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps we may fairly infer from the silence of so well-read a liturgist as Mr. F. E. Warren that he has not traced this Collect to an earlier source. But the opening phrase, 'Creator naturarum omnium,' he finds in the Mozarabic service for the Nativity of John the Baptist, and the Collect has a certain luxuriance of language that suggests an Eastern source.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Todd is disposed to think the verses were composed at Derry before Columba's removal to Hy (*Liber Hymnorum*, Fasciculus II.). The poem takes its name from the opening, which runs:

'Altus Prosator, Vetustus  
Dierum, et Ingenitus.'

The Marquis of Bute has edited the poem in a separate form, 'with a prose paraphrase and notes.'

<sup>5</sup> *The Altus of St. Columba* (Lord Bute's edition), p. 34.

The one interesting and characteristic point of this verse is the *Librosque conscientiarum* of the seventh line, and that point is not reproduced in the Collect; so that it is scarcely worth while to refer to the *Altus* as a source for thoughts that are suggested by the most familiar passages of Scripture. But why should not the phrase 'books of conscience' appear in the Collect?<sup>1</sup>

Before leaving the subject of the new Collects we may add that another contribution to the revised Liturgy from the *Book of Deer* will be found among the post-communion thanksgivings. The original and the English are as follows:

'Deus tibi gratias agimus per quem mysteria sancta celebravimus, et a te sanctitatis dona deposcimus, miserere nobis Domine, salvator mundi, qui regnas in secula seculorum. Amen.'

'O Lord, our God, thou Saviour of the world, through whom we have celebrated these sacred mysteries, receive our humble thanksgiving, and of thy great mercy vouchsafe to sanctify us evermore in body and soul, who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.'

The striking address to the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity as *Deus* is perhaps obscured by the manner in which, in the translation, the words *Domine salvator mundi* are here transferred from the end to the beginning.

Returning now to the opening of the Liturgy, we observe in the rubric directing the reading of the Epistle and Gospel that the Bishops have deleted the direction '*At the end of the Gospel the Presbyter shall say: Thus endeth the Holy Gospel.*' In the Scottish Prayer-Book of 1637 we find this direction for the first time, under the form, '*So endeth the Holy Gospel.*'<sup>2</sup>

The late Dr. John Mason Neale considered that this was the *only* point in which the Scottish is inferior to the Anglican rite. 'Ritualists,' he writes, 'as you are aware, give two reasons why that which concludes the Epistle ought not to be said of the Gospel. The one, because it is the *everlasting* Gospel; the other, because in point of fact it is not then ended, since

<sup>1</sup> The thought is familiar to students of patristic and mediæval literature. Thus St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, lib. xx. c. 14): '*Et alius inquit liber apertus. Quædam igitur vis est intelligenda divina, qua fiet ut cuique opera sua, vel bona vel mala, cuncta in memoriam revocentur, et mentis intuitu mira celeritate cernantur, ut accuset vel excuset scientia conscientiam, atque ita simul et omnes et singuli judicentur.*' Again, St. Bernard (*Tract. de Conversione*, c. 2): '*Aperitur conscientiarum liber, revolvitur misera vitæ series,*' &c.

<sup>2</sup> For the probable source of the introduction of the phrase see Dowden's *Historical Account*, &c., p. 192.

the Creed is simply its further development.<sup>1</sup> The first of these reasons is fanciful enough, but the second may well be the real reason why the Gospel is treated differently from the Epistle. It was perhaps not noticed by Dr. Neale that the English Book of Common Prayer has here a rubric which would hardly have been penned by men who had consciously in mind the point which he emphasises, 'And the Gospel ended, shall be sung or said the Creed following.'

The revised Liturgy enjoins both 'Glory be to Thee, O Lord' at the announcement of the Gospel, and 'Thanks be to Thee, O Lord, for this Thy glorious Gospel' at its conclusion.<sup>2</sup>

Two changes—both, as will probably be acknowledged, improvements—in punctuation have been made in the Nicene Creed. The comma after 'Lord,' in the phrase 'the Lord and Giver of life,' was adopted in the Irish 'Book of Common Prayer' in 1877 as being more likely to suggest the true sense of the original, τὸ κύριον καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν. The recent American revision has authorized its insertion, and now the Scottish Liturgy follows their example. With the same precedents a semi-colon is substituted for a comma after 'Father' in the passage 'Being of one substance with the Father, by Whom all things were made.'<sup>3</sup>

A strong desire has been felt in some quarters (and it has been strongly expressed) that the word 'holy' should be inserted in the clause, 'And I believe one [holy] Catholick and Apostolick Church.' And it must be acknowledged that there is much to commend this restoration. But the Bishops, probably, felt that it was scarcely the part of the Scottish Church to venture, without the general concurrence of the Churches of the Anglican Communion, upon any alteration whatsoever of the wording of the Creeds.<sup>4</sup> If this were so in the case of a comparatively unimportant addition, the proposal to omit the *Filioque* clause would meet with still less favour.

<sup>1</sup> *An Earnest Plea for the Retention of the Scottish Liturgy*, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> We notice also a minute change in the wording of the rubric which, if attended to, will prevent an objectionable mode of announcing the Gospel that is not unfamiliar, viz. 'The Holy Gospel is written in the — chapter of *that* according to St. —,' while it should be, 'The Holy Gospel is written in the — chapter of the Gospel according to St. —.'

<sup>3</sup> The English Prayer Book which we have used in this comparison is Dr. A. J. Stephen's text taken from the 'Sealed Book' for the Chancery, and collated with seven other 'Sealed Books.'

<sup>4</sup> The problem how it was that the word 'holy' came to be omitted by the Reformers in 1549 has been discussed in the *Church Quarterly* for July 1879.

giving  
for  
rubric  
been  
to re  
(now  
and  
Furt  
time  
&c., i  
the w  
ing t  
judgm  
T  
are g  
that r  
refere  
partu  
other  
with t  
rubric  
poor i  
'Ap  
in the p  
shall be  
the oth  
charita  
of their  
This r  
Office,  
the de  
wished  
after t  
have b  
of 163  
passag  
The  
the wor  
present  
<sup>1</sup> Th  
the Cale  
from the  
Saints' d  
VOL.

After the Nicene Creed follows the rubric directing the giving of notices, '*and the prayers of the Church may be asked for any for whom they are desired,*' together with another rubric directing that '*If there be a sermon it followeth here.*'

As a matter of convenience in the use of the book, it has been thought well, after the example of the American Church, to relegate to the end of the Office the two long exhortations (now seldom used), 'Dearly beloved, on — day next,' &c., and 'Dearly beloved brethren, on — day I intend,' &c. Further, the use of the exhortation ('at the Communion time') 'Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come,' &c., is left to the discretion of the Presbyter, and in the text the words 'we eat and drink *our own damnation* not *considering* the Lord's Body,' are changed into 'we eat and drink *judgment to ourselves* not *discerning* the Lord's Body.'

Two new offertory sentences (Psalm xl. i, and Acts xx. 35) are given places in the revised Liturgy. It is a curious fact that not one of the sentences in the Prayer-Book of 1637 had reference to almsgivings. Here there was a deliberate departure from the Prayer-Book of 1549, which in so many other respects had largely influenced it. And much of a piece with the absence of such sentences is the still more curious rubric at the close of the service, which places the relief of the poor in a very subordinate position:—

*'After Divine Service ended, that which was offered shall be divided in the presence of the presbyter and the churchwardens, whereof one half shall be to the use of the presbyter to provide him books of holy divinity; the other half shall be faithfully kept and employed on some pious or charitable use, for the decent furnishing of that church or the public relief of their poor, at the discretion of the presbyter and churchwardens.'*

This rubric had been long ago removed from the Communion Office, but it was not till now that it was sought to supply the deficiency in the offertory sentences. One could have wished that the beautiful sentence from Tobit, 'Be merciful after thy power,' &c., had been introduced; but this would have been a departure from the principle of the Prayer-Book of 1637, which was to remove from the Church's services passages from the Apocryphal Scriptures.<sup>1</sup>

The next alteration that deserves notice is the change of the word 'oblations' (as applied to the gifts in money to be presented in a basin on the Holy Table) into 'offerings.'

<sup>1</sup> Thus the *Benedicite* was omitted, and all the Apocryphal Lessons from the Calendar, but under strong pressure from England some few Lessons from the *Book of Wisdom* were introduced among the Proper Lessons on Saints' days before the Prayer-Book was printed.

Etymologically, it is true, 'offerings' and 'oblations' are indistinguishable; but as a matter of fact the word 'oblations' has come (especially among recent writers) to be more and more restricted to the elements of bread and wine as offered for use in the Sacrament.<sup>1</sup>

In the Scottish Communion Office the money-offerings are presented on the Holy Table with words adapted from David's blessing of the Lord as given in 1 Chron. xxix. 10 *sq.* These, in the present Scottish Office, precede the offering of the Elements. It is proposed in the revised Liturgy to place them *after* the Elements have been presented, and to change the words 'both riches and honour come of Thee,' of 1 Chron. xxix. 12, into the more comprehensive words of verse 14, 'all things come of Thee, and of Thine own do we give unto Thee.'<sup>2</sup>

We have already entered on the part of the service where the characteristic Scottish differences are most marked. The order of the parts, as we may remind our readers, are the *Sursum corda*, Preface, and *Sanctus*; the Prayer of Consecration; the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, and the Lord's Prayer; the Short Exhortation, Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words; the Collect of Humble Access; the Communion of Priest and People; Post-Communion Thanksgiving; the *Gloria in Excelsis*; the Peace. In the revised form the order of the parts is unchanged.

The next feature of interest in the revised Liturgy is the

<sup>1</sup> It is quite common in our day to explain the phrase (in the Prayer for the Church Militant) 'our alms and oblations,' as unquestionably equivalent to 'what is offered in the alms-dish and the Bread and Wine.' That this is not so absolutely certain as is commonly assumed will be seen by quoting the rubric from the Prayer Book of 1637, which, as is well known, largely influenced the revision of 1661: '*While the Presbyter distinctly pronounces some or all of these sentences for the offertory, the deacon (or if no such be present) one of the churchwardens, shall receive the devotions of the people there present in a bason provided for that purpose. And when all have offered, he shall reverently bring the said bason, with the oblations therein, and deliver it to the Presbyter, who shall humbly present it before the Lord,*' &c. If we suppose that one of the Sentences, such as 'Do ye not know that they who minister about holy things live of the sacrifice?' &c., is used, and the collection made for the clerical stipend, such collection would be very improperly presented before the Lord as *alms*.

<sup>2</sup> The well-known words τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέρομεν in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, and the similar expressions in the Liturgies of St. Basil, St. Mark, &c. (Swainson, *Greek Liturgies*, pp. 130, 161, 152), were probably suggested by 1 Chron. xxix. 14, ὅσα τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δεδωκαμέν σοι (LXX). Prospectively, the words in the Scottish Liturgy may have the same reference as that of the phrase as it occurs in the Eastern Liturgies.

addi  
seven  
nunc  
Apos  
issue  
Prefa  
forth  
yet h  
In tw  
media  
guida  
beaut  
reade  
Prefa  
propo

'V  
trum;  
promis  
virtus a  
surus a  
tuarum

Th  
'Th  
the Sav  
truth to  
by his  
look for  
&c.

For  
Missal

'Ven  
sanctoru  
in eorum  
sortium,  
nubem t  
men et  
Jesum C  
introtus

While t

'Wh  
graces, T  
with so g  
their exa

<sup>1</sup> Mis



addition of Proper Prefaces for Advent, the Epiphany and seven days after, the Feasts of the Purification, of the Annunciation, and of All Saints, together with a 'Common' of Apostles and Evangelists. And we understand that since the issue of the draft the Bishops have been urged to add also Prefaces for Lent and Passiontide. The Prefaces now put forth have kept well in view the lines of ancient models, and yet have been framed with a certain spirit of independence. In two cases, Advent and the Feast of All Saints, where the mediæval missals of Scotland and of England afforded no guidance, the revisers have obtained help from among the beautiful Prefaces of the Paris Missal. It will interest our readers to infer the spirit in which the suggestions of these Prefaces are dealt with, by printing them together with the proposed Prefaces.

'Vere dignum . . . æterne Deus, per Christum Dominum nostrum ; quem perditio hominum generi salvatorem misericors et fidelis promisti, cujus veritas instrueret inscios, sanctitas justificaret impios, virtus adjuvaret infirmos. Dum ergo prope est ut veniat quem misurus es et dies affulget liberationis nostræ ; in hac promissionum tuarum fide piis gaudiis exultamus. Et ideo cum Angelis,' &c.<sup>1</sup>

The proposed Preface runs as follows :—

'Through Jesus Christ our Lord, whom Thou didst promise as the Saviour of mankind, by his sacrifice to redeem the lost, by his truth to instruct the ignorant, by his holiness to sanctify the sinner, by his power to strengthen the weak, that we, without fear, might look for his second and glorious appearing. Therefore with Angels,' &c.

For the Feast of All Saints, and seven days after, the Paris Missal prescribes the following :—

'Vere dignum . . . æterne Deus, qui glorificaris in concilio sanctorum, et eorum coronando merita coronas dona tua : qui nobis in eorum præbes et conversatione exemplum, et communione consortium, et intercessione subsidium : ut tantam habentes impositam nubem testium, per patientiam curramus ad propositum nobis certamen et cum eis percipiamus immarcescibilem gloriæ coronam, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum cujus sanguine ministratur nobis introitus in æternum regnum,' &c.<sup>2</sup>

While the new Preface for the Scottish Liturgy runs thus :—

'Who art glorified in all thy Saints in whom, crowning their graces, Thou crownest thine own gifts, and hast compassed us about with so great a cloud of witnesses that in their fellowship, and after their example, we may run with patience the race that is set before us,

<sup>1</sup> *Missale Parisiense* (edit. 1739), p. 261.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 268.

and together with them receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away. Therefore,' &c.

We can quite understand the disinclination the Bishops have shown to a plain rendering of the beautiful expression of St. Augustine's that is here incorporated, 'eorum coronando merita coronas dona tua.'<sup>1</sup> 'The merits of the Saints' is a phrase that, doubtless, one can see some reasons for avoiding, yet the fine antithesis of the original is much obscured, if not entirely lost, in the words 'in whom crowning their *graces* Thou crownest thine own gifts.'<sup>2</sup> If the word 'worthiness' or 'virtues' were substituted for *graces*, it might be desirable to conclude the Preface in the terms of the original, which would probably make it satisfactory to those most likely to object. This ending attributes all to our Lord in a very full manner thus,

'... a crown of glory that fadeth not away, through Jesus Christ our Lord, through whose precious blood an entrance is ministered to us into his everlasting and glorious kingdom. Therefore,' &c.

The other additional Prefaces need not delay us. We must content ourselves with transcribing only one. That for the Feast of the Purification is as follows:—

'Because thy blessed Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, made of a woman, made under the law, and as on this day presented in the Temple, was revealed to thy servants as a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel. Therefore,' &c.

We have next to point out that the Bishops propose to enlarge our present *Sanctus*, so that it will run (akin to the prevailing form in both East and West),

'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Hosanna in the highest! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Glory be to thee, O Lord most High.'

<sup>1</sup> See *Sermo cccxxii.*, in *Natali Martyrum* (Tom. v. 1296), 'Cum ergo Deus coronat merita tua, nihil coronat nisi dona sua.' The same thought occurs frequently, as in *Epist. cxciv.* (Tom. ii. 720); *Enar. in Psalm xcvi.* (Tom. iv. 1064); *Sermo de Verbis Johan. vi.* (Tom. v. 644), &c.

<sup>2</sup> Such passages as Psalm lxii. 6, Matt. xvi. 27, Rom. ii. 6, and Rev. xxii. 12 (*καὶ ὁ μισθὸς μου μετ' ἐμοῦ*), might suggest the word 'works,' yet the thought of the Preface has reference not to external works, but to the internal virtues that exhibited themselves in those works. We should be disposed to suggest the word 'deservings' or 'worthiness,' which, as being less associated with theological controversy, would be less likely to give offence, or (if that is still felt to be objectionable) the word 'virtues.' In support of this latter alternative we may cite from the Scottish Liturgy itself (here taken from Edward's First Book): 'and we yield unto thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy saints.'

We now have arrived in our account of the draft liturgy at the Prayer of Consecration, the most important change in which we have laid before our readers in the earlier parts of this article. We have only to add here, first, that in the part of the prayer called in the marginal rubric 'The Oblation,' the words italicised in the following have been introduced :—'We thy humble servants, *looking for his second and glorious appearing*, do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty with these Thy holy gifts which we now offer unto Thee, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make.' This is certainly in entire accord with ancient precedent, and leads our thoughts to the words of St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 26): 'For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death *until He come*.' Secondly, in the phrase 'to be a reasonable, holy, and *lively* sacrifice unto Thee,' the obsolete 'lively' becomes 'living.' And similarly, in the prayer 'for the whole state of Christ's Church,' 'Thy true and lively Word' becomes 'Thy true and living Word.'

In the Lord's Prayer, the Scottish Bishops in 1764, read 'who' for 'which' in the opening words. From their Office the American Church has probably adopted the word 'who.' But in Scotland usage seems to have been mainly (at all events in the present century) in favour of 'which,' and in the Draft Liturgy 'which' is replaced.

In the short address 'Ye that do truly and earnestly,' the Bishops propose to insert for the first time, the words 'with faith' after the words 'draw near.' We say 'for the first time,' for the present Scottish Communion Office has all along followed here the wording of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637.<sup>1</sup>

We need not call attention to any other changes till we reach the words of delivery, where the prevailing practice of saying 'preserve thy body and soul' instead of 'thy soul and body' (as in the edition of 1764) is adopted. And without any consideration of the question which form is best authenticated, reasons of convenience, in view of the number of churches where both the English and the Scottish offices are used would necessarily weigh much with the revisers.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The words 'with faith' were introduced into the English Book of Common Prayer only at the last revision.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop Dowden says: 'I cannot pretend to explain why the changed order was adopted by Bishop Falconar (in 1755). Perhaps it was to follow the order of the words 'our souls and bodies' in the Consecration Prayer, or to suggest the thought of the superior worth of the soul; or perhaps it was suggested by the words of one of the prayers used by the Celebrant in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, when communicating himself,

Immediately after the communion of the people in the present Scottish Office, the Priest, after covering 'that which remaineth of the consecrated elements,' turns to the people and delivers a short address, exhorting them to thankfulness for admission 'to the participation of His holy mysteries,' and to prayer for grace 'to perform our vows and persevere in our good resolutions.' This 'sermonette,' as it has been sometimes styled, is a feature introduced for the first time in 1764. It is a modification of the 'bidding' of the deacon in the Clementine Liturgy,<sup>1</sup> but an address to the people at this solemn moment has comparatively little liturgical authority, and has by many been felt to be less suitable than an immediate act of thanksgiving. It was the original design of the Bishops to remove this address altogether, but for various reasons it was eventually resolved to recast it in the form of a thanksgiving, and in this form it now appears in the Draft Liturgy, and may be used either together with, or as a substitute for, two other post-communion 'Collects of Thanksgiving.' In the second of the collects, 'Almighty and everlasting God,' &c. (the second of the two alternative thanksgivings according to the English rite), the phrase 'such good works as Thou hast *prepared for us* to walk in,' was (we believe in 1764) altered into 'such good works as Thou hast *commanded us* to walk in.' We presume this change was made through a dread (surely an ill-founded dread) of a Calvinistic interpretation being given to the words. However this may be, the revisers have restored the expression as it originally stood. A third 'Collect of Thanksgiving,' which we have already noticed<sup>2</sup> as taken from the *Book of Deer*, has been added for use at the discretion of the Priest.

The revisers propose no change in the very peculiar text of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which differs from the text of the English Prayer Book in several important particulars, and would seem to have been derived from the form of this hymn as it appears in the *Codex Alexandrinus* (where it is entitled ὕμνος ἐξωθινός), supported by the text as given in the Apostolic Constitutions (lib. vii. c. 47). Since the Scottish Bishops in the last century made the changes in the text of the hymn as it appeared in Laud's book, research in the department of Celtic ecclesiastical *origines* has shown that some similar variations are

in which he entreats God that 'the participation of the holy mysteries' may be εἰς ἱερὴν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος even as in St. James's Liturgy there is a post-communion prayer that it might be εἰς δῆμιον ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων.

<sup>1</sup> See Dowden, *ut sup.*, p. 223.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 61.

to be  
and  
T  
Scot  
comm  
editi  
reser  
truth  
sligh  
editi  
Skin  
the m  
auth  
reser  
been  
prese  
word  
that  
the p  
W  
expre  
as a  
unive  
Office  
1792  
Presb  
prepa  
thoug  
In  
atten  
to the  
W  
careful  
valuab  
1 S  
The la  
Scottis  
out of  
for the  
2 In  
ing tra  
clergy  
Prayer  
pure a  
same is  
Altar.

to be found in the *Gloria in Excelsis* of the ancient Irish Church, and therefore, doubtless, of its daughter Church in Scotland.<sup>1</sup>

Those of our readers who are familiar with the text of the Scottish Office as it appears in many of the editions in common use will probably be struck, on comparing these editions with the revised text, that the Rubric for permitting reservation for the sick is not to be found in the latter. The truth is that the rubric in the common texts is without the slightest authority. It is absent from the texts of both the *editio princeps* (1764) and the form certified by Bishop J. Skinner in 1792, and these two are the forms that can make the most plausible, though still unsatisfactory, pretensions to authority. But though this is so, it is no less a fact that reservation for the sick and those unavoidably absent has been commonly practised in Scotland both in the last and present century. And the familiar rubric might easily be so worded as to discountenance reservation for any purpose but that expressly specified, if there were cause to apprehend that the practice might be abused.

We may also observe that some had hoped for a more express recognition of the 'mixed chalice.' We believe that, as a matter of fact, the mixed chalice is universal, or all but universal, in those churches where the Scottish Communion Office is used.<sup>2</sup> The existing rubric of the texts of 1764 and 1792 has been supposed to refer to the mixture—'The Presbyter shall then offer up and place the Bread and Wine prepared for the Sacrament;' but a more express rubric, though only permissive, would seem to many to be desirable.

In concluding this article we would call the particular attention of those of our readers who are liturgical scholars to the following words of the Scottish Bishops:—

'We are desirous of having the Draft now put forth fully and carefully discussed in the Diocesan Synods, and hope to obtain valuable suggestions from Churchmen generally—not only from those

<sup>1</sup> See Warren's *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, p. 193. The late Dr. Neale fell into the curious mistake of supposing that the Scottish bishops in the last century interpolated the *Gloria in Excelsis* out of their own heads as a protest against Arianism (*An Earnest Plea for the Retention of the Scottish Liturgy*, p. 17).

<sup>2</sup> In 1847 Bishop Torry, then in his eighty-fourth year, was representing traditional practice when, in accordance with a petition from his clergy that he should 'attest the usages of the Church of Scotland,' his Prayer Book appeared with the rubric: 'It is customary to mix a little pure and clean Water with the Wine in the Eucharistic Cup when the same is taken from the Prothesis or Credence to be presented upon the Altar.'

who use the Scottish Office habitually, but also from any who are liturgical scholars.'

We have no doubt that the Bishops will welcome suggestions from competent liturgists in the sister Churches as readily as those from members of the Scottish Church.

We have here laid before our readers an account of the Liturgy which the Bishops declare to be 'in itself and intrinsically superior to any of the forms of the Scottish Office that have yet appeared,' and which comes to us with all the weight of their unanimous consent. We have scrupulously confined ourselves, it will be seen, to a statement of facts. We have eschewed, for the present, all expressions of approval or disapproval which might bias the judgment of our readers. Here and there, indeed, we have ventured on some observations suggested by the proposals before us; but these have been mainly connected with the ritual and literary character of the intended changes, and we have strictly avoided the discussion of the dogmatic aspects of the proposed change in the Epiklesis, upon which a variety of opinion is sure to express itself.

---

#### ART. IV.—W. G. WARD AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

*William George Ward and the Oxford Movement.* By WILFRID WARD. (London, 1889.)

THE early life of William George Ward can hardly fail to be a study of deep interest to all who are desirous of a thorough acquaintance with the history of the greatest movement in the English Church since the Reformation. Not only was his mind one of the keenest and most acute which took part in it, but he was possessed of that enthusiasm and ardour of character which naturally drives men to action, and to a desire to influence those around them. He was also singularly fearless and outspoken in enunciating his views, often with an extravagance, partly indeed playful and assumed, but also partly arising from a curious absence in so powerful a mind of some talents essential to a sound judgment. He was gifted with singular charms, both of temper, manner, and conversation—charms not always common in a University, and which, combined with his ability, made him a real power for some years in Oxford, where he undoubtedly did much to



precipitate a large portion of his party into the Church of Rome. His influence over the great man, Cardinal Newman, whose name will be ever associated with the Secession, was in some respects a marked and peculiar one, although we think that Mr. Wilfrid Ward has somewhat mistaken and overstated it. But that he was a man of a high and powerful mind, and a most remarkable, though in some respects a very peculiar and almost eccentric character, cannot be doubted. No historical or philosophical student of the history of the English Church can be fully equipped for his work who has not studied this volume diligently.

Mr. Wilfrid Ward may certainly be said to have done his work extremely well. If in some respects, as we are obliged to think, he has been a little blind to a few faults which affected the career and the intellectual character of his father, no one can blame a son for *that*. It is perhaps a more serious blemish that by the world at large we suspect that the life will be found somewhat lengthy. The mass of mankind quickly forget the details of any ecclesiastical movement, however important, which took place fifty years ago, and Mr. Ward seems to us to have sometimes traversed the same ground more than once. But this has been partly due to what is in some respects an excellence—to the very various accounts which Mr. Ward has collected from his father's friends of his social and conversational gifts, and the thousand anecdotes of his fresh and genial character. The variety of his intimate acquaintances is itself rather confusing. The late Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Newman and Cardinal Manning, Father Faber and the Dean of St. Paul's, were all his familiar friends; the Poet Laureate has written an epitaph on him, 'whose living like I shall not find'; Lords Selborne, Cardwell, Sherbrooke, Blachford, were his intimates as undergraduates; the Bishop of London, Lord Coleridge, the late Dean Stanley, the Dean of Durham and the (late) Dean of Norwich, the Master of Balliol and Arthur Clough the poet, were all his pupils and friends at Balliol, and have mostly contributed their warm remembrances; and this very *embarras de richesses* makes the work difficult to deal with. But this is perhaps a rather complimentary ground of complaint. And in all important points, in the fulness of the picture of Mr. Ward, in the fairness with which he has dealt with his opponents, in the power with which he has brought out many essential points of Mr. Ward's philosophy, the work leaves little to desire. It should be observed that it does not profess to be merely an account of Mr. Ward, but of the

'Oxford Movement,' and as such we shall as far as possible treat it. We only regret that in the brief space of a Review we shall be obliged to deal with many points more curtly than the importance of the subject, and the picturesqueness of the description, deserve.

William George Ward was born in London on March 21, 1812, the son of an eminent merchant who had represented the City of London from 1826 to 1835, a considerable financier, but almost better known as one of the best cricketers of his day, who had made one of the highest scores (278) ever recorded. In his childhood he seems to have shared the fate of one equally eminent, though heartily opposed to him in religious matters, Lord Shaftesbury, for he was little understood by his parents, and was left to work his own way in the formation of his character and tastes, helped, however, by the affection of a sister, whose early death during his career at Oxford was a heavy blow to him. 'The child was father of the man;' and as a child he cared for little in the world but mathematics, music, and the theatre, though even then he was not unaffected by the religious character of a governess in his family. He was scarcely eleven years old when he was transferred from a private school to Winchester; and there, though his character ripened considerably, he was 'not like other boys,' says his contemporary, Lord Selborne, 'even in the commonest things.' His person was always somewhat too heavy and ungainly for games, though he so far inherited his father's taste that up to a late period at school he always stood umpire at cricket—a little trait which his son has somehow forgotten to mention. His intellectual tastes and distastes soon, however, began to betray themselves, especially his equal love of mathematics and music, his strong and manly scholarship, combined with an amusing antipathy to anything bearing the name of poetry, whether in the shape of English or Latin verses. With his humorous performances in this respect he was fond of regaling his friends at Oxford, especially with 'a fine passage' in a poem on Daniel in the Lion's Den:

'Cras rex solque simul surgunt, rex advenit antrum,  
Et voce exclamat magnâ, "Nunc si potes exi;"  
Respondet Daniel, "Rex, vive in sæcula cuncta."

Lord Selborne, to whom his school remembrances are chiefly due, adds some lines from a poem, for a gold medal (!), on Mexico, after the following fashion. Beginning with—

'Far from a merry key, I now must sing,  
Though to America my muse takes wing ;'

it goes on—

‘But Cortes tried to execute his plans  
Against the unoffending Mexicans.  
What had they done to him, the savage man,  
That he against their liberty should plan?  
Nothing at all!—but he both wanted gold  
And fame, no other motive can be told.’

But his schoolboy days were not altogether happy ; and he always retained a strong, and probably exaggerated, impression of the general immorality of the school, which led him afterwards warmly to admire the great work of Arnold as the elevator of the moral tone of the English Public School.

To a boy of this kind, with singular original tastes and abilities, which his schoolfellows could hardly understand, a University is not uncommonly the beginning of a new life ; and on his coming to Oxford, in October 1830, Ward may be said to have found himself for the first time at home, especially as a vacant interval of a year had allowed him to develop his powers of thought and reading in all directions. His first three years at Oxford were spent at Christ Church, where his friends are described by Lord Selborne : ‘We lived,’ he says, ‘in the same set, consisting chiefly of Balliol and Trinity men, with a few from Christ Church, and some other Colleges’ (p. 19), and he includes among them Tait, Cardwell, Lowe, and others whom we have already mentioned. Desultory both by inclination and health, he was never a steady or accurate student ; his real work consisted chiefly in his devotion to the ‘Union’ Debating Society, and his principal reading lay in writings of the Utilitarian School, which he was asserted by Mr. Gladstone in the *Quarterly Review* to know far better than the writings of all the English Divines put together—especially the two Mills and Bentham, whose common-sense Radicalism was much stronger in him than his imaginary Toryism ; while in theology Whately, then the one bold thinker in Oxford, was his Pope ; and, unless we are much mistaken, this incapacity for steady work, joined to a dislike and total ignorance of history and a noble contempt of ‘facts,’ was the foundation of his later exclusive belief in Logic as the one master science of all thought.

A failure in his father’s fortune is supposed to have first turned his mind to the necessity of a fellowship, and of a high Class as a means to it ; and his extraordinary performance in the ‘schools,’ where only his cleverness secured him a ‘second,’ and his constant reply to his examiners’ questions, ‘I haven’t the slightest idea,’ ‘I know nothing whatever about it,’ was the

amusement of the day at Oxford. He stood, however, somewhat daringly for a mathematical fellowship at Balliol, where his election is graphically described by Dean Goulburn, one of his earliest pupils, in a passage which we slightly abridge:—

‘Shall I ever forget,’ he says, ‘when I first heard his name, and heard it associated with my own? My father had allowed me to come up from Eton to try my luck for a Balliol scholarship. The examination was over, and the boys from various schools were assembled in the College Hall, on the tiptoe of expectation to hear the announcement. Good, cultivated little Mr. Oakeley emerged at last from the Common Room, and we all clustered like bees around. After a customary exordium about the goodness of the candidates, &c., &c., the choice, he said, had fallen on Mr. Tait (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury) and Mr. Ward for the Fellowships, and on Mr. Lake (the present Dean of Durham) and myself for the Scholarships. I have a sort of dim memory that I then saw your father in the Quadrangle, his friends gathering round him and warmly grasping his hand; and someone said to me, “That is Mr. Ward”’ (p. 130).

A mathematical tutorship soon followed upon this, and Mr. Ward at once took a prominent part for the following ten years (from 1835 to 1845), very nearly coinciding with the whole Newman Oxford movement, in the intellectual life of the University.

The characteristic features of Mr. Ward’s mind were so much born with him, and so little changed by education, that we have thought it right to describe even what may seem to some the trivial side of his boyish and early Oxford days. We shall now trace his course more minutely, and for the sake of clearness may divide it into (1) The sketch of his earlier opinions before he attached himself to Mr. Newman and the Oxford movement; (2) The peculiar form in which he accepted the movement, and endeavoured to influence the English Church; (3) The interesting question to which Mr. Wilfrid Ward has devoted an important chapter, as to the effect of Mr. Ward’s peculiar line of thought, both upon the later English Church and upon the sceptical theories of the last twenty years.

I. No part of Mr. Ward’s volume is more interesting than the chapter in which he brings before us three movements which were most actively at play, speaking generally, from about 1825 to 1845, and which he describes as first the movement ‘partly political and partly philosophical and religious (or rather anti-religious) of Bentham and the two Mills; and next, the teaching, ethical and theological, of Whately and Arnold, the precursors of the Broad Church School; and

lastly, the directly theological school of Newman and Pusey.' It may sound, indeed, almost absurd to connect Bentham and the elder Mill with any sort of religious teaching, when we remember that John Stuart Mill has described his father's two great 'objects of detestation as an aristocracy and an established Church, the great depravers of religion and opponents of the progress of the human mind.' But it is a curious fact in university history that while the influence of the Utilitarian School was for some ten or fifteen years very powerful at Cambridge, in the persons of the two Austins, Charles Buller, and others, scarcely a single follower could be pointed to at Oxford, except in the very mitigated form of Mr. Ward himself. Almost all thought at Oxford, whether in clergymen or in laymen—such, for instance, as Lord Shaftesbury, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Selborne—was, from the year 1825 to 1845, of a more or less theological character, of which Oriel College was long the centre, while the centre of Oriel in its earlier days was Dr. Whately, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin. He was a man of robust and acute, and of a generous but somewhat rough and essentially unpoetical, character, well fitted to break ground for the deep religious theories which were soon to follow, but incapable of retaining the allegiance of his greater pupils, such as John Henry Newman. Unlike his friend, Dr. Arnold, Whately was connected with no system of religious thought; but his essays on *Christianity* and on *The Difficulties of St. Paul* had done much to check the dominant tone of Evangelicalism; and though it was a current joke in Oxford that the character of the man was best expressed by the names of his works, *Doubts, Difficulties, Errors, and Peculiarities*, he was essentially high-minded and religious; and those who remember the striking poem of Bishop Alexander on his death will feel that his difficult career as Archbishop of Dublin had been one of no ordinary greatness. He was almost the first to discern, beneath its veil of modesty and reserve, the genius of Mr. Newman, and had induced him to act as his vice-principal at St. Mary's Hall; and no one who has ever read it can forget the touching tribute to him in the *Apologia* :—

'I owe him a great deal. He was a man of a generous and warm heart. He emphatically opened my mind, and taught me to think and use my reason.'

But the same great authority has added, in a letter written in 1834 :—

'I can feel no reluctance to confess that, when I was first noticed

by your Grace, gratitude and admiration of your powers wrought upon me ; and, had not something within me resisted, I should certainly have adopted views on religious and social duty which seem to my present judgment to be based in the pride of reason and to turn to infidelity, and which in your own case nothing but your Grace's high religious temper has been able to withstand.'<sup>1</sup>

Such was the most vigorous religious thinker at Oxford from about 1825 to 1830, to whom it was natural enough that Mr. Ward should have been attracted by his manly common sense, and, perhaps, even by the want of poetry which gave him a certain congeniality with the school of Mill and Bentham. A much higher influence was that of Dr. Arnold, to which Mr. Wilfrid Ward has paid a more just tribute than is common in the present day, when, though his influence survives him, his reputation has been somewhat eclipsed by that of his brilliant and graceful, but far less powerful, son. For Dr. Arnold was undoubtedly a very remarkable man, no less in his strength of character than in his great practical powers of action, and his high and original historical gifts ; and it is almost startling to remember that, occupied as he had incessantly been as the reformer of education, and the head of a great public school for the last fifteen years of his life, and dying at the age of forty-six, he has left writings of such varied power behind him. But his very originality made him too bold and confident as a speculator ; and, with little time to work out his theories, his historical gifts were at once a fertile source of his truth and his errors. This was particularly seen in his conception of the Church, the darling dream and almost the dying prayer of his life, which, though in practice it was a strange extravagance, is certainly remarkable as showing how strong a hold the idea of the Church, as the great acting force of Christianity, had obtained over the mind of a powerful thinker. For Arnold's ideal, as Mr. Ward has justly described it, was 'the absolute identity of Church and State,' as combining the highest principles with the most absolute power ; and this great result was to be achieved, as he believed to have been intended by Henry VIII. and Cranmer, by investing the State with a more than Papal power, to combine all sects and communions into a miscellaneous mass, of which Parliament was to be the spiritual ruler and director : a dream which gave him not a few qualms when he thought of the numerous avowed unbelievers in Parliament, and which was utterly demolished soon after his death by the admission of the Jews.

<sup>1</sup> Newman's *Apologia*, p. 382.

Mean  
tendo  
even t  
world  
it was  
by M  
'was  
life in  
derab  
all the  
bread  
was a  
Arnol  
which  
Bu  
charac  
and r  
Oxford  
place,  
side o  
Caroli  
stitution  
govern  
ridicul  
that t  
aposto  
cellenc  
In the  
him a  
was ob  
unity  
passag  
to hav  
Thus,  
he say  
'Av  
dissens  
the Ch  
meanin  
claimed  
Church  
magnifi  
notions  
'We da



Meanwhile this very thought of one great united National Christendom had, no doubt, the power which attaches to all ideals, even the most extravagant, and, backed as it was by the unworldliness and straightforward courage of Arnold's character, it was naturally for a time adopted by his attached pupils and by Mr. Ward himself. 'The conception,' says Mr. W. Ward, 'was obviously Utopian, but Arnold's influence in breathing life into the decaying Establishment was undoubtedly considerable.' 'The Liberal party,' adds Cardinal Newman, 'grew all the time I was in Oxford even in numbers, certainly in breadth and definiteness of doctrine and of power. And, what was a far higher consideration, by the accession of Dr. Arnold's pupils it was invested with an elevation of character which claimed the respect even of its opponents.'<sup>1</sup>

But there were other points in which Arnold's original character told not only upon Ward himself, but upon Oxford, and may be even said indirectly to have influenced the Oxford movement in its Romeward direction. In the first place, he had very little sympathy with the more Catholic side of the English Church, especially in its Laudian and Caroline period—'dress, ritual, ceremony, . . . the superstition of a priesthood without its power, the form of episcopal government without its substance'; and he treated with more ridicule than even Mr. Ward and Mr. Newman the theory that the Church of England was the happy, 'pure and apostolic' *Via Media*, combining in its existing form the excellencies, without any of the defects, of all other Churches. In the second place, his eulogies of the Church of Rome made him almost a Newmanite before Mr. Newman himself. He was obviously, in fact, attracted almost against his will by the unity of which he was in search, and the following striking passages are only a few out of many in which he may be said to have almost played into the hands of his great opponent. Thus, in urging the necessity of union in the English Church, he says:—

'Aware with characteristic wisdom of the deadly evil of religious dissensions, the Church of Rome ascribed to the sovereign power in the Christian Society an infallible spirit of truth, whereby the real meaning of Scripture might be certainly and authoritatively proclaimed; and if the Scriptures were silent, the living voice of the Church might supply its place. . . . It made laws for *Christendom*, a magnificent word, and well expressing those high and consistent notions of unity on which the Church of Rome based its system.' . . . 'We dare not analyse,' he adds, 'too closely the motives of our best

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 50.

actions ; but if ever grand conceptions of establishing the dominion of good over evil may be allowed to have concealed from the heart the ignobler feelings which may have been mixed with them, the excuse may justly be pleaded for Gregory VII. and Innocent III. The infallibility of the Church was the fond effort to believe in the support which its weakness so needed ; its unity was a splendid dream, beautiful but impracticable.<sup>1</sup>

Such were the hands through which Ward had passed up to about the year 1838, when he might still be almost described as 'a young Englishman in search of a religion'; while for nearly three years he had been discussing all things human and divine in his almost daily walk with Arthur Stanley, then a scholar of Balliol, of all Arnoldians the most typical, though even he seems to have had a momentary qualm (*very* momentary, we suspect) as to his position. Meanwhile 'the Oxford movement' was beginning gradually to lose its early character of a defence, pure and simple, of the English Church. Mr. Newman had somewhat ominously expressed his opinion that, if it was to succeed, it must allow a free expression of individual conviction—the 'Ghost' of Romanism, as he called it, had more than once crossed his path—and the Anglican Reformers were soon afterwards to receive from Mr. Hurrell Froude the same handling which Archbishop Cranmer always received from Lord Macaulay. All this was a great attraction to Mr. Ward, who, as his son frankly tells us, had never any real affection for the English Church ; 'he disliked it in the present, and knew nothing of it in the past ;' he had, in a word, none of that knowledge of its history, of that patriotic tenderness to it as the Church of his country, or of those loving associations of family, of childhood, and of conversion, which retained for twenty years the deeper thought and heart of John Henry Newman. Mr. Ward was, in fact, as Cardinal Newman has told us,<sup>2</sup> 'Never a Tractarian, never a Puseyite, never a Newmanite ; he was one of a small party of eager, acute, resolute minds, who had heard much of Rome, and cut into the original movement at an angle, and then set about turning it in a new direction.' The most remarkable men of this party were Mr. Ward and Father Faber, the Oratorian ; and, though less known, Father Dalgairns.

As Mr. Ward's work professes to be in part a history of 'the Oxford movement,' it may be well to glance briefly at the earlier stage of its career, before it reached the point of which we are speaking. Mr. Newman tells us that he always

<sup>1</sup> *Principles of Church Reform*, pp. 272, 283.

<sup>2</sup> *Apologia*, p. 163.

regarded July 14, 1833—on which a famous sermon of Mr. Keble's had been preached—as the birthday of the attempt—and certainly it cannot be called an unsuccessful one—to revive a higher tone of doctrine and practice in the English Church, which he and Mr. Keble, in conjunction with Hugh James Rose, Mr. Palmer, and (though later) Dr. Pusey, inaugurated. And for a few years it went on upon strict Anglican or 'Laudian' lines, equally opposed to Romanism and Dissent, and as the great antagonist to that so-called 'liberal' thought in theology which has since that day culminated in Oxford. In this purely Anglican phase (from about 1834 to 1839) it became exceedingly popular with the clergy, while Arnold, who, as we have seen, had his own notions of a drastic Church reform, is amusingly described in his *Life* by Stanley as at once startled and indignant at finding his path crossed by a compact party, who reproduced (in his view) all the worst errors of the Nonjurors. Mr. Newman, meanwhile, whatever his misgivings, was loyal to his Church, and his 'Lectures on Romanism and Popular Protestantism,' delivered in 1838, were one of his last generous efforts to hold his post to the end. This halcyon state of things was first rudely interrupted by the joint publication by Mr. Newman and Mr. Keble of *Froude's Remains* in 1841. Mr. Hurrell Froude was one of those men of much force of will and real genius, whose power is best appreciated by the influence which they exercise over others; and there is a reality and a beauty of character in his private Journal—'Confessions' we had almost called it—which go far to explain his power over Cardinal Newman and Mr. Keble. He died very early, in 1835, and certainly with no distinct determination towards the Roman Catholics, 'Miserable Tridentines,' as he jokingly called them. But his antipathy to the reformers was still more unmistakable: 'The special charm of the book,' writes Mr. Ward to Dr. Pusey, 'is his hatred of our present system and of the reformers, and his sympathy with the rest of Christendom.' The publication of such a work was regarded as *letting out the secret*. A typical High-and-Dry Churchman, Dr. Faussett, the Oxford Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, opened fire at once in a pamphlet of rather heavy calibre, which was answered very amusingly by Mr. T. Mozley, then editor of the *British Critic*, by the epilogue of the two dogs, 'Fido' (Mr. Newman) and 'Jowler' (Dr. Faussett), the latter being the pet of the servants and regaled by all the tit-bits of the kitchen, while poor Fido was left out in the cold. A very different and effective pamphlet was published at the same

time by Mr. Newman, thrown off, as it was then believed, in a single day. But the murder was, so to speak, out. The old original party of the movement was thenceforth broken up: the antipathy to Cranmer and Jewel, and the admiration of the Roman Saints and formularies and practices, was the watchword of many of the more distinct 'Newmanites'; and Mr. Ward, it is needless to add, was jubilant. 'Restoration of active communion with the Roman Church,' he writes in 1841, 'is the most enchanting earthly prospect on which my imagination can dwell.'<sup>1</sup>

We have spoken somewhat prematurely in describing the publication of *Froude's Remains*, rather than that of 'No. 90,' as the first occasion which tended to separate many of the friends of the Oxford movement from their leaders; but it was the event which first indicated the strong feeling of Mr. Ward for the Church of Rome. And before going further it may be well to describe more fully than we have yet done the remarkable character of whom Dean Stanley speaks too unreservedly as succeeding Mr. Newman as the acknowledged leader 'of the Movement party.'<sup>2</sup> The fact rather was that, by the retirement of Mr. Newman in 1841, the party was left without a head, and we must doubt whether Mr. Ward's character, however able, would ever be fitly described as that of a leader. 'Party manœuvring,' says his son—and we might add, party action—'was out of his line. . . . His friends 'called him the *enfant terrible* of the party.'<sup>3</sup> And as certainly 'none but himself could be his parallel,' so his impetuosity always made him the very Rupert of divines. It is difficult, indeed, to give any adequate idea in a short compass of his strange, amusing, and attractive versatility, his extraordinary acuteness of reasoning, combined at once with an equally boundless love of fun on the one side and an occasional deep depression on the other. 'Intellect,' he said once laughingly to Henry Wilberforce, 'is a wretched gift, my dear Henry—absolutely worthless. Now my intellect is in some respects almost infinite, and yet I don't value it a bit.'<sup>4</sup> His own mental powers, however, were emphatically one-sided—a wonderful gift of argument and analysis, with considerable moral and metaphysical insight, a perfect temper, and an ever-fresh flow of the most genial conversation, but somewhat marred by a curious want of poetry and imagination, an absolute dislike of everything like history, and a noble indifference to facts, which made him utterly un-

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 142.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 213.    <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 217.    <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 35.

balanced in his statement of his case and his conclusions. He always accepted the charge 'that he shirked history because he was ignorant of it, as entirely true. He was,' he said, 'deplorably ignorant of facts,' and usually, when strictly cross-questioned, would answer, 'Newman told me so.' Nor was his want of poetical imagination, which came out in the heaviness of many of even his ablest writings, less marked. 'Your book,' said the quaint and shrewd old Master of Balliol to him, 'is like yourself, Ward, heavy, awkward, and unwieldy;' and his son describes his very effective articles in the *British Critic* as 'very uncouth in form, heavy in style, one-sided in treatment, abounding in abstract argument to the exclusion of historical research or critical scholarship.'<sup>1</sup> One striking exception must be made to his want of poetry—his passionate sense of the beauty of religious services, combined with his love of music. No devotee was ever more completely absorbed in the services of the Breviary and the Mass, and we believe it to have been this, the poetical side of his character, which drew him from early youth to the Church of Rome.

It may perhaps give a livelier idea of his character if we describe a single day of his life. Two or three sketches by his earliest friends will help us to do so. Take first the account of his first lecture in 1839 to Mr. Temple, now Bishop of London, then his most promising mathematical pupil. Mr. Ward received him warmly, looked through some mathematical exercises which he had given, and the work went on for a quarter of an hour at highest pressure.

'Then Mr. Ward got up, stood with his back to the fire, and . . . asked abruptly, "Have you been to London lately?" and then proceeded, "You should go to the Olympic and see 'Olympic Devils'; it is quite as good as or better than 'Olympic Revels.' " And forthwith the grave mathematical tutor commenced giving an accurate and dramatic sketch of the plot of the burlesque . . . for example, the chorus of gods at dinner to the tune of "The roast beef of Old England" :—

"If mortals who cannot exist upon air  
Could see us at dinner, ye gods, how they'd stare;  
See us hydrogen quaff, and on oxygen fare,  
Singing, oh! the roast beef of Olympus,  
And, oh! the Olympic roast beef."

'Or, again, Orpheus's monologue in Tartarus :—

"'Tis said that marriages are made above,  
And so perhaps some few may be by love;  
But, from the smell of brimstone, I should say,  
They must be making matches here all day."

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 218.

Thenceforth, according to the Bishop of London's account, 'the hour set apart for his coaching was about equally divided between the differential calculus and the conversation on the drama or opera, but later on, as Ward attached himself to the Tractarian party, more often on theology and the prospects of the Church of England.' Such was his lecture with a lively pupil, then of strong High Church proclivities. His quieter pupils were not equally favoured; but when the luncheon hour was passed—always an important one with Mr. Ward—the almost daily walk with Stanley from 1835 to 1838, and with Clough from 1839 to 1841, followed, and the character of both has been described by Archbishop Tait, by the Dean of Durham, and by Clough himself. Stanley, indeed, and Ward during their period of greatest intimacy were pretty much at one in their opinions; it was otherwise with Clough, and perhaps the most touching letter in the volume is that in which Mr. Ward describes his sorrow for having tried to 'force prematurely my own convictions on the attention of a young man just coming up to college . . . and to aim at making him as hot a partizan as I was myself . . . The result was not surprising. I had been prematurely forcing Clough's mind, and there came a reaction. . . . I cannot to this day think of all this without a bitter pang of self-reproach.'<sup>1</sup> Such were the engagements of the afternoon. After dinner the Balliol common room was in those days a scene of the liveliest conversation in Oxford, and the Dean of Durham and Mr. Jowett both describe 'the daily and most friendly battle' there between 'Mr. Ward and the future Archbishop of Canterbury,' 'each in very different ways equally able and to their old pupils equally lovable.'<sup>2</sup>

We may complete the above sketch of Mr. Ward's character at the period of which we are speaking (1840) by two quotations, one from his son and the other from the Dean of St. Paul's.

'His politics,' says Mr. W. Ward, 'were to a great extent Liberal, while those of the party were Tory; he steadily refused to sacrifice his private friendships . . . to the demands of party feeling, and consequently was a welcome guest in circles in which the appearance of a Puseyite was otherwise a rare phenomenon; and conversely he broached theories—in High Church circles—little to the taste of the school which claimed to succeed to the opinions and traditions of Archbishop Laud. . . . He preserved throughout, in his advocacy of the Catholic opinions, the method which he had first learned at the hands of Arnold and Whately. Dialectics were his constant

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 119.



weapons of attack, and discussion the instrument alike of his intellectual progress and of his influence on others. . . . His exposition commenced with the first principles of the moral law, and advanced, in completest logical form, to Catholicism itself. Even where he defended instinctive faith his defence abounded in logic. "He is always arguing," it was said of him, "against the propriety of arguing at all."<sup>1</sup>

Upon this the remarks of the Dean of St. Paul's are a lively and impartial commentary.

'He lived,' he says, 'in an atmosphere of discussion with all around him, friends or opponents, fellows and tutors in common rooms, undergraduates after lecture, and out walking. The most amusing, the most tolerant man in Oxford, he had round him perpetually some of the cleverest and highest scholars and thinkers, who were to be the future Oxford; and where he was there was debate, cross-questioning, pushing inferences, starting alarming problems, beating out ideas, trying the stuff and mettle of mental capacity. . . . Always rapid and impetuous, taking in the whole dialectical chess-board at a glance, he gave no quarter; and a man found himself in a perilous corner before he perceived the drift of the game; but it was to clear his own thought, not—for he was much too good-natured—to embarrass another. . . . The stress he laid on the moral side of questions, his own generosity, his earnestness on behalf of fair play and good faith, elevated and purified intercourse. But he was not generally persuasive in proportion to his powers of argument. Abstract reasoning in matters with which human action is concerned may be too absolute to be convincing. It may not leave sufficient margin for the play and interference of actual experience. And Ward, in perfect confidence in his conclusions, rather liked to leave them in a startling form, which he innocently declared to be manifest and inevitable. And so stories of Ward's audacities and paradoxes flew all over Oxford, shocking and perplexing grave heads with fear of they knew not what.'<sup>2</sup>

The above may be taken as a perfect summary of Mr. Ward's daily life and influence during the last four years of his life at Oxford, and it describes, more exactly than we think Mr. W. Ward has done, his position there; for, while Dean Stanley may be right in calling him 'the most important element of the Oxford School at this crisis,'<sup>3</sup> he would never be properly described as its 'acknowledged leader.' He was rather what we have seen him roughly called, its 'Goad.' The one person who, even in his retirement at Littlemore, was still the inspiring genius, 'the master light of all its Seeing,' to his party was Mr. Newman; without him the party, we may confidently say, would at once have broken to pieces; and he, as his letters to Mr. Hope Scott

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 214.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 215.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 211.

and others clearly indicate, was still resisting with that moral caution which has been always his leading attribute the impetuous pressure of his ardent disciple.<sup>1</sup> 'You are quite right,' he says in a letter to Mr. Hope Scott so late as September 1843, 'in saying that I do not take Ward and Oakeley's ground, that all Roman doctrine may be held in our Church, and that as Roman I have always and everywhere resisted it.'<sup>2</sup> It is necessary to remember this, because an impression is conveyed, not unnaturally, by Mr. Wilfrid Ward's way of putting the matter, that his father was now a sort of intellectual 'director' to his 'Pope,' as he always called Mr. Newman. That his keen logic may have influenced him we do not deny, or that it may even have hastened his departure from the Church of England. But the course of a great genius like Cardinal Newman is always his own; though it is only too manifest that this course was greatly affected by his growing isolation, and by the absolute want of any sympathy from all the rulers of the Church, in which he had been almost the ruling spirit for ten years.

II. It is necessary, however, to return to the chronological course of events which now began rapidly to develop both Mr. Ward and the Oxford movement, and which may be called the second period of his connexion with it. It was early in March 1841 that the first act occurred on the part of Mr. Newman which had any direct reference to the Church of Rome. Up to that time, and distinctly in the previous year, Mr. Newman's language had been often marked by a severity for which he afterwards reproached himself. But the under-current of feeling, both in himself and in several of his junior friends, of whom Mr. Ward was chief, was strong, and it was this which led to the act which almost unconsciously developed Mr. Newman's growing feeling towards the Church of Rome, and coloured the last four years of his own and Mr. Ward's life in the English Church. We allude, of course, to the publication of the famous 'No. 90' of the *Tracts for the Times*, of which the almost avowed object was to show that the 'Thirty-nine Articles' were not inconsistent with the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome. The history of the Tract itself, as described by Mr. Newman in the *Apologia* (p. 77), is indeed a very curious one, and shows how little he himself intended it either for a defence of the Church of Rome or a sophistical evasion of the Articles.

'The great stumbling-block,' he says, referring obviously to his

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 213.

more advanced friends, 'lay in the Thirty-nine Articles. It was urged that here was a positive note *against* Anglicanism. Anglicanism claimed to hold that the Church of England was nothing else than a continuation in this country of that one Church of which in old times Athanasius and Augustine were members. But if so the doctrine must be the same; the doctrine of the old Church must live and speak in Anglican formularies. Did it? Yes, it did; that is what I maintained; it did in substance, in a true sense. Man had done his worst to disfigure, to mutilate the old Catholic truth; but there it was in spite of them in the Articles still. It was there, but it must be shown. It was a matter of life and death to us to show it. . . . I would not hold office in a Church which would not allow my sense of the Articles. My tone was, This is necessary for us, and have it we must and will, and if it tends to bring men to look less bitterly on the Church of Rome so much the better.'<sup>1</sup>

We have given Mr. Newman's own account of the origin of the Tract, on account of the importance of the subject; but it was soon seen that the real question involved was not the agreement of the Thirty-nine Articles with the early Church so much as with the Church of Rome, and this was the one point for which Mr. Ward and the younger Romanizing party cared. The Tract was undoubtedly written with the object professed, but its argument led it to maintain that the Thirty-nine Articles, having been framed before the publication of the Tridentine Decrees, could not have been intended to attack them, and the question inevitably became whether the Roman view of the Mass, of Purgatory, of the Invocation of Saints, and the like were tenable in the Church of England. The actual controversy is too minute to enter upon; and Dean Stanley is perhaps right in saying that the real conclusion of the Tract was 'that all Roman doctrine might be held within the limits of the English Church';<sup>2</sup> but it may be well to state that upon the Tract itself the whole of the older Oxford party manfully sided with Mr. Newman; Dr. Pusey, Mr. Palmer, and Dr. Hook wrote vigorously in its favour, and only a few years before his death it was republished by Dr. Pusey as an evidence of his sense of its value. It is indeed a curious indication of the state of Mr. Newman's feeling at this time, for while he did not hesitate still to denounce the practical teaching of Rome, 'to judge by what we see of it in public and viewed as a popular system,' he added that 'she alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called Catholic.'

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> *Life*, p. 173.

Meanwhile the actual history of 'No. 90' and its controversy were certainly not deficient either in important results or in lively and even amusing incidents, as was sure to be the case wherever Mr. Ward was concerned. A protest was at once issued by four tutors, of whom the best known was Mr. Tait, Ward's fellow-tutor at Balliol, addressed to the then Board of Heads of Houses, who carried a resolution to the effect that the Tract 'evaded rather than explained the Articles, and was inconsistent with the observance of the Statutes'; and the vigorous controversy which followed first brought Mr. Ward before the public, in two pamphlets, one stronger than the other, but both distinctly Roman and anti-Anglican. For whereas Mr. Newman's tone had been, in spite of one or two sarcasms on the 'stammering lips of ambiguous formularies,' to minimize the Protestant character of the Articles, Mr. Ward's was rather to *emphasize* it, and his argument was pretty much that of the old dictum attributed to Lord Chatham, that 'the English Church has Calvinistic Articles, a Popish Prayer Book, and an Arminian clergy'—in other words, that no party strictly adheres to all the forms of the Church. As for himself, he first invented the now familiar term of '*non-natural* sense,' in which he avowed that he signed the Articles,<sup>1</sup> and had no difficulty in pointing out that Arnoldians and Evangelicals alike were in the same predicament in signing the Ordination Service. Lastly, with no great consistency, while stating in one pamphlet<sup>2</sup> that 'one of the numberless marks we have on us of being a living branch of Christ's Church is that the Roman Church and ours together make up an adequate representation of the early Church,' he added in the second that all he contended for was 'that of the two, the English and Roman Churches, the latter was, in spite of her corruptions, a great deal purer . . . her system higher, her sons much more favoured.'<sup>3</sup>

One natural result of all this was considerable dismay amongst his brother tutors, and we might add his kindly 'Master,' Dr. Jenkyns. Ward, Tait, and Scott were, indeed, *privately* the best of friends, and Tait, it seems, told Ward that 'he was very much pleased with my way of putting things';<sup>4</sup> but he certainly managed to 'dissemble his pleasure' when he 'kicked his friend downstairs,' by rousing the Master, who had been found asleep in a vain effort to read Ward's long pamphlet, to dismiss him from his tutorship. The Master was still reluctant, for 'Really, Tait,' he said, 'I find Ward so

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 173.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 180.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 165.<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 173.

amusing and agreeable that it is almost impossible to believe that he says those *dreadful* things in print.' In the end Ward himself cut the matter short by coming to him one day and saying, 'I have come, Master, to resign my two lectureships into your hands. I must, if your views on these questions are the true ones, be a most dangerous man, and I don't see that you have any choice in the matter.' The Master was quite disarmed. 'Really, Ward, this is quite like your generosity.'<sup>1</sup>

We may briefly sum up the results of the whole of this act of the movement in the words of Mr. Wilfrid Ward.

'The proceedings against Tract 90 marked,' he says, 'an epoch in the Movement. It was never again what it had been. The attitude of the Heads of Houses was one of open hostility and persecution; and the attitude of the Bishops, though less pronounced, was similar in character. Up to this time the Movement had not looked beyond the Church of England. Her authority had been regarded as final, her formularies as placing an unquestioned limit to speculation. But the action of the authorities changed all this. While the more moderate party sorrowfully acquiesced in defeat, the more extreme grew indignant and rebellious.'<sup>2</sup>

With the events of the next three years, 1841-44, we shall deal as briefly as possible, when Mr. Ward, having now escaped the responsibilities of his Balliol tutorship, applied himself vigorously to literature, and, according to Sir W. Palmer's account, 'this audacious intellect was by Mr. Newman's principle set free to deal with religion in the *British Critic* according to the bent of its genius.' What that bent was there was little doubt; and Mr. T. Mozley, then its acute editor, discovered at once that its 'terminus was outside the English Church,'<sup>3</sup> and while he tells us that he 'read Ward's articles with a pleasurable excitement akin to that which some children have in playing on the edge of a precipice,' he adds that 'I did but touch a filament or two of one of his monstrous cobwebs, and off he ran instantly to Newman to complain of my gratuitous impertinence.' They showed, however, in some respects remarkable power, and though he describes his own style and language as 'harsh, dry, and repulsive'—faults which his writing never overcame—we find them quoted by others as 'surprisingly beautiful,' and it was certainly no slight feat to win the applause at once of Mr. Newman and of Mr. John Stuart Mill. They were mainly, however, an anticipation of his *Ideal of a Christian Church*, of which we shall have to

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 173.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 185.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 219.

speak presently, and chiefly served the purpose of dismaying his older friends, especially Dr. Pusey, and prompting the younger Roman party. Events, moreover, were now constantly occurring which helped his influence. The Jerusalem bishopric, originally a scheme of Chevalier Bunsen's—a bold attempt at the time to combine the Lutheran with the Anglican Church, and taken up with eagerness by the English bishops—had almost completed Mr. Newman's conversion; Dr. Pusey's famous sermon on the Eucharist was condemned in 1843 by the Oxford Board of 'Six Doctors,' and himself suspended from preaching for three years; while the chorus of disapproval in the charges of the Episcopal Bench, directed especially against Mr. Newman, was unanimous. He himself meanwhile had retired into what was practically lay communion at Littlemore, where his original idea had been to form a species of monastic establishment; and his feeling is expressed by the melancholy words which he uttered about this time—'This is no longer any place for us; let us go hence.'

This state of things reached its climax when the *Ideal of a Christian Church* appeared in the summer of 1844—'an overgrown pamphlet,' according to the account of its author, and uniting all the merits and defects of his mode of writing, but which created perhaps the greatest immediate sensation which any ecclesiastical work in the English Church has ever produced. Written with the avowed object of showing the superiority of the Roman over the English Church,

'all England,' to adopt Mr. Mozley's description, 'was moved by it. Having elaborated a good logical defence, Ward took his ground, and defied Church and State, Bishops and Universities, to shake his reasonings or drive him from his post. The defiance was so loud, so insulting, so explicit, the shame of not meeting it so great and so inevitable, that the other side had no choice but to quit themselves like men.'<sup>1</sup>

The ablest reply was undoubtedly that of Mr. Gladstone in the *Quarterly Review*, and with this and the *Ideal* before us we will endeavour to give some account of the great closing conflict of the first part of the Oxford Movement.

The real objection to the *Ideal* is what was always Mr. Ward's weak point, its exaggeration, its entire want of balance, and its ignorance of history. We are not concerned here to defend either the theory and the practice of Luther or the pliability of Cranmer and the cruel tyranny of Henry

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 247.



VIII.; for the first little has been said since the crushing attack of Sir William Hamilton, while (*non obstante* Mr. Froude) Lord Macaulay has disposed for ever of the second. But the history of the English Church is, in great measure, independent of the faults of those who were perhaps the main agents in its Reformation, and the serious charge against Mr. Ward is, not only that he was totally ignorant of the history of the Reformation itself, but that he entirely ignored all that the Church of England has done for the English people. Admit, as much as you will, many of his attacks: the extreme incongruity of doctrines within the same pale; the incapacity, till within the last forty years, of enlisting enthusiasm in its service; the arrogance and self-satisfaction which often equally ignored the defects and neglects in carrying out its own principles, and the excellence of other Churches. 'Fas est et ab hoste doceri;' and no devout mind, except of the narrowest type, can refuse its meed of admiration to a Church which is still of necessity the great centre of Christendom, which can train minds like those of Lacordaire, Father Damien, and Cardinal Lavigerie, or Montalembert and Eugénie de Guérin among its laity, or win converts like Newman and Manning and Hope Scott. But the honour of two great Churches like those of Rome and England is not promoted by that from which the noblest members of each abstain, invective and misrepresentation, and what Mr. W. Ward calls his father's 'detestation of the English system.' Such charges as that 'ever since the schism of the sixteenth century the English Church has been swayed by a spirit of arrogance and self-complacency resembling an absolute infatuation,'<sup>1</sup> or, as the heading of chapter vi. in the *Ideal* expresses it, that there has been 'a total absence of moral discipline for the rich and the poor, and a total neglect of its duties as a witness to morality,' are equally untrue to fact, and sat strangely upon one who still professed attachment to his own Church. They laid him open to the most crushing passage in Mr. Gladstone's powerful article, where he says, 'Whether the Reformation were a blessing or not . . . it is important above all things that the principle should be maintained, that those who judge without examining should be called to account, and that children—the demand seems not immoderate—should not strike a parent until they have heard her.'<sup>2</sup>

Here, then, as his best friends could not but feel, lay what we may call the weakness, both moral and intellectual, of Mr. Ward's work—his long antipathy to his own Church and

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 278.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 300.

his incapacity to see where its strength lay. A logician above all things, the logical and systematic power of the Roman Church had captivated him; and he had shown a strange ignorance of one of the most striking features in the character of his own country. If we may once more quote Mr. Gladstone in a passage which Mr. W. Ward has not noticed,

'he was never struck by the fact that a nation, which is by universal confession one of the most powerful and distinguished in the world, is nevertheless in civil and social, as well as religious matters of practice, one of the least systematic: it trusts more to personal character and less to external law.'<sup>1</sup>

And this remark may well be supplemented by one of a more impartial observer, for it has often seemed to us that no more worthy testimony to the English Church and character can be produced than the following passage from M. de Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, which we venture to give in full:—

'In spite of a thousand false conclusions the English nation is the one which has best preserved the three fundamental bases of all society—the spirit of freedom, the domestic character, and the religious mind; . . . and this nation, in which a perfectly pagan pride survives and triumphs, remains, even in the bosom of error, the most religious of all European nations.'<sup>2</sup>

It is needless to describe the state into which the English Church was thrown by a work so unparalleled in its annals; let us now turn to its immediate results. The October term of 1844 in Oxford was one of continual excitement, the first scene of which in Balliol College Chapel will not be forgotten by those who witnessed it, when Dr. Jenkyns, on the Day of St. Simon and St. Jude, anticipated Mr. Ward's reading of the Epistle of St. Jude, and read with great emphasis himself, 'Certain men are *crept in amongst you, ungodly men . . . who despise dominion and speak evil of dignities.*' It was well known that the 'Heads' were preparing some crushing measure; but the secret was well kept, and only partially leaked out, till it appeared on December 13 in the shape of a triple Statute, *first* to condemn Mr. Ward, reflecting severely on his good faith; *then* to reduce him to the state of an undergraduate; and *lastly* to pass a strict test intended specially to hit 'No. 90,' and to declare that henceforth the Articles must be accepted and signed in the sense of their writers, whatever

<sup>1</sup> *Quarterly Review*, Dec. 1844, lxxv. 176.

<sup>2</sup> *Monks of the West*, iii. 7 (Translation).

'Th  
writing

<sup>1</sup> L  
<sup>4</sup> J  
<sup>7</sup> E

that might be. The effect of this was at once to unite the High Church and the Liberal parties, and indeed almost every University man of ability in Mr. Ward's favour. Up to this time opinions had curiously differed. Nearly the whole of the High Church party had felt strongly some of the objections we have made to the *Ideal*. 'What do you think of it?' said Mr. Dalgairns to Mr. Newman.' Newman shook his head; 'It won't do,' he said.<sup>1</sup> The young Liberal party, such as Mr. Stanley, who had strongly opposed his friend Tait's attack on 'No. 90,' probably liked it best, and the most curious approbation of all was expressed by Mr. John Mill: 'I always hailed Puseyism,' he said, 'and expected that thought would sympathize with thought;'<sup>2</sup> and his chief living friend adds: 'The *Ideal of a Christian Church* was an epoch-making book to me, as I fancy it was to many now living.'<sup>3</sup> Mr. F. Maurice was equally strong, and expressed himself with his usual generosity. Mr. Tait, then head-master of Rugby, was decided against proposing any test, 'which would narrow the limits of the Church of England.'<sup>4</sup> Nor were Mr. Ward's High Church friends behind them. Mr. Keble, 'amid serious disagreement from some of his principles,' was yet 'deeply grateful for his work, and appreciated the many noble traits of character which his writings disclose;'<sup>5</sup> while the strongest of all, especially as regarded Mr. Ward's good faith, was Dr. Moberly, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury.

'I know enough of it,' he says, 'to know it to be a dangerous book; but, the University must pardon me, *I know Mr. Ward too*; and I know him to be a man of the most thorough and upright integrity. I will not and I cannot be a party to a sentence which goes out of its way to declare that he is not an honest man. . . . What class of man in our Church may not read in that book the most awakening lessons of personal holiness and Church duty?'<sup>6</sup>

Thus, when February 13—the day for the contest—arrived, the 'Heads,' though nominally strong among the 'Low Church' and the 'High and Dry' parties, were morally fighting a losing battle. The feeling was even more decided against the 'test' than against the condemnation of Mr. Ward. The day itself was marked by one of the most violent snowstorms within the memory of man.

'The undergraduates,' says Dean Stanley, in almost the last writing he ever published, 'ardently participated in the excitement of

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 295.<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 294.<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 313.<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 318.<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 315.<sup>7</sup> *Edinburgh Review*, April 1881, cliii. 322.

their seniors, watched the procession . . . with mingled howls and cheers, and one of them, of more impetuosity than the rest, climbed to the top of the Radcliffe Library, and . . . pelted the Vice-Chancellor with a shower of snowballs to testify his detestation of the obnoxious measure.<sup>7</sup>

Meanwhile the theatre, one of Wren's greatest works, and well fitted for such a scene, was full of eager Churchmen, Lord Ashley (Shaftesbury) and Mr. Gladstone representing the opposite sides as laymen; the Fellows of Balliol, past and present, had mustered strong and unanimous for Mr. Ward, containing among them the future Archbishop of Canterbury and the future Bishops of London (Temple) and Salisbury (Moberly), the Deans of Rochester and Durham, Dr. Jowett, Lord Lingen; every High Churchman—Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, Dr. Hook—was present; Archdeacon Samuel Wilberforce, almost alone of his friends, voting against Mr. Ward, who made his appearance in the Rostrum, being allowed the unusual privilege of speaking in English. 'They would never,' said Mr. Stanley to Mr. Jowett, 'have let Ward speak in English if they had known how well he would speak.'<sup>1</sup> His speech, which lasted about an hour, was delivered with great rapidity, spirit, and coolness, and certainly with no attempt at conciliation. 'I really am astonished,' said the late Canon Mozley, 'at the number and the sort of men who supported Ward after such avowals as he made. If he said once he said twenty times in the course of his speech "I believe all the doctrines of the Roman Church."<sup>2</sup> The result may be given in Mr. W. Ward's own words and those of Mr. Stanley:

'The speech over, the Vice-Chancellor put the question. There was a roar and counter-roar of "*placets*" and "*non-placets*." A scrutiny was then ordered, and the first resolution—the censure of the passages from the *Ideal*—was carried by 777 to 391; the second—the degradation—by a much smaller majority, of 569 to 511. Then came the proposal for [the Test and] the condemnation of Tract 90. The Vice-Chancellor read the resolution. But now the two Proctors rose, Mr. Guillemard and Mr. Church, the present Dean of St. Paul's, and uttered the words which, except on one memorable occasion (the Hampden case), no one now living had ever heard pronounced in Convocation. When the resolution was put a shout of "*Non*" was raised, and resounded through the whole building, and "*Placets*" from the other side, over which Guillemard's "*Nobis Procuratoribus non placet*" was heard like a trumpet, and cheered enormously. The Dean of Chichester threw himself out of his doctor's seat and shook both Proctors violently by the hand; and without a

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 340.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 342.

word more being spoken, as if the Proctors' Veto stopped all business, the Vice-Chancellor tucked up his gown, hurried down the steps which led from his throne to the area, and out of the theatre; and in five minutes the whole scene of action was cleared.<sup>1</sup>

It is needless to describe the immediate feelings produced on most of the assembly by this striking scene. Mr. Ward accepted his condemnation in a very characteristic manner, having taken the whole matter with great coolness, and even left it to Mr. Stanley to write his very telling peroration. There is a curious anecdote—reported with a slight inaccuracy by Mr. W. Ward, but which we may give on the best authority—of his introduction on the same afternoon to Archdeacon (now Cardinal) Manning, who was startled by the levity with which he treated so serious a crisis, and remonstrated on some of the violent anti-Lutheran invective in his book. 'Oh! but,' said Mr. Ward, 'the principles *you* are now laying down, Mr. Archdeacon, would logically tend to thorough Atheism.' 'I will only reply,' said Mr. Manning. 'that the most Lutheran book I have ever read was called *The Ideal of a Christian Church*.' But a more startling event was in store for his friends the next morning by Mr. Ward selecting so singular a moment to announce, what had been kept a profound secret, his shortly approaching marriage. The curious incongruity of the time chosen made this almost a case of 'solvuntur risu tabulæ,' and Mr. Stanley, Ward's closest friend, has even 'referred to it as the collapse of the movement.' This seems to us extravagant, for the real 'collapse' lay in the secession of Mr. Newman in November 1845. But Mr. Ward's friends certainly felt that the announcement reflected greatly on his taste and judgment, and was a practical satire on his advocacy of asceticism, and Mr. Keble and Mr. Manning were both 'deeply pained.' To Mr. Ward himself the event was the happiness of his life. With his usual unworldliness he cared little for the immediate poverty which both this and his secession to the Roman Church involved. He was the natural heir to a large estate in the Isle of Wight, but its disposition was in the hands of his uncle, whom his course had greatly displeased. He was received into the Church of Rome in the summer of 1845, and spent what he describes as the happiest years of his life as Professor of Theology in St. Edmund's College, near Ware. Eventually he succeeded, very unexpectedly, to the whole of his uncle's large fortune. Let us hope that his later career may be described in a subsequent volume.

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 342.

We must content ourselves with a few brief remarks on the concluding and interesting chapter of Mr. W. Ward's work, which discusses the permanent influence of his father and other eminent leaders of the early Oxford movement upon the English Church. We must at once, however, demur to Mr. Ward's frequent and significant expression, 'the collapse of the Oxford Movement'—which is, indeed, somewhat inconsistent with his own argument that the influence of Mr. Newman's philosophy (no small part of the 'Movement') has affected religious thought of every kind—and to his admission that numerous doctrines and practices for which Mr. Newman contended have taken a strong and increasing hold upon the English Church. The difference of practice and teaching between the Church of 1844 and that of 1889 supplies at once a further refutation of the *Ideal*, and an evidence that the Movement, while it has extended its character, has increased its strength; or, according to a shrewd remark of Mr. Jowett's, that 'during the last twenty years, when it has been most silent, it has exercised a greater influence than formerly.'<sup>1</sup> No one who considers such practices as those to which we have already alluded—the position of the Service of the Holy Eucharist and the different view of it expressed by Mr. Keble's alteration of his own words, the vast increase of daily Services, of Retreats, of the practice of Confession, of Sisterhoods, and the demand of which we have lately heard so much (let us hope, not in mere words) for a religious Order—can doubt of the firm hold which the Catholic revival is taking upon the religious mind of England. Mr. Ward has, indeed, expressed pointedly the objection which he naturally takes to this, in the extreme incongruity of doctrines within the same Church, when he urges that the 'bond among Anglicans is becoming purely external,' and that 'parsons holding the views of the Bishop of Lincoln claim to belong to a Church which tolerates the almost positivism of Canon Fremantle.'<sup>1</sup> But the adequate answer to this lies, as we believe, in the fact that the Church of England, if it claims to be a national Church, must of necessity be a comprehensive one; and that, in spite of an undeniable amount of vague and inconsistent teaching, it is still of all bodies the best adapted to do the work of Christ in England.

On the other point to which we have referred we can agree with Mr. W. Ward far more completely—the powerful influence upon religious thought, apart from any question of Churches, which has been exercised by his father's writings,

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, p. 379.



and still more by those of Cardinal Newman. It can surely have been only the wish which fathered the thought of Dean Stanley which led him to assert that the whole Oxford Movement was one of trivialities, and to forget Cardinal Newman's University sermons—the precursors of his *Grammar of Assent*—when he speaks of 'the staple of his teaching.' One of the greatest merits of that eminent writer is the intuitive genius with which he has anticipated the attacks of most modern sceptics on Christianity, and supplied the most powerful instrument for their refutation in the true theory of Conscience—the 'testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ'—the manner in which he has shown that, in the educated religious mind, every faculty in the heart and soul 'cries out for the Living God.' This, when fully worked out, is the real rock against which all the winds and storms of scepticism will beat in vain, and while Cardinal Newman's work is the most perfect form which it has assumed in this century, it is no slight tribute to Mr. Ward's share in this high argument that Mr. J. S. Mill always spoke of him as the most powerful opponent that he could possibly have had. No doubt this point must not be left to stand alone; it must go *pari passu* with the critical and historical evidences for Christianity, derived from the Scriptures and the history of the Church; and in one of these respects Mr. Ward would probably concede that the writers of the Roman Church, to whom we owed much two hundred years ago, have for more than a century been defective. We could ill spare, for the defence of Christianity, the great works of Bishop Lightfoot, or of Delitzsch and Weiss. May it be long our happiness to find that in these two main branches of Christian argument the great teachers of the Roman and of other Churches can work together as brethren.

But it is time to bring our remarks to a close. We have found it difficult in some respects to do justice to the character of a man of great ability, one of whose most remarkable features was that he was so unlike other men. In attempting to do this we have not shrunk from the duty of pointing out some considerable intellectual defects, which, while they even contributed to his power of stimulating thought, unfitted him for the task of leading or guiding it; a want of proportion in his writings and opinions, the extreme and unbalanced conclusions to which he often pressed them, and his indifference to knowledge and to gifts which he did not possess. But our sketch has been very imperfect if it has not also shown his intense love of truth, his eagerness to follow it at whatever cost to himself, and his dislike to unreality of any kind. And

when we add to these moral qualities such gifts of reasoning and conversation as we have described, such a freshness, warmth, and geniality of heart, few will deny that there must be great lessons to be learnt from one with whom many, in his own communion as well as in ours, might have strongly disagreed, but to whom none who knew him ever felt unkindly. In almost the last public utterance of the late Archbishop of Canterbury he expressed the warm and Christian feeling that his two friends, whom he had then just lost, Mr. Ward and Father Oakeley, were two of the best men he had ever known; and we cannot conclude our criticism more fitly than in the memorial lines of the Poet Laureate, which Mr. W. Ward has prefixed to this volume:—

‘ Farewell ! whose living like I shall not find,  
Whose faith and work were bells of full accord—  
My friend, thou most unworldly of mankind,  
Most generous of all Ultramontanes, Ward !  
How subtle at tierce and quart of mind with mind !  
How loyal in the following of thy Lord ! ’

---

#### ART. V.—THE AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH.

*The American Commonwealth.* By JAMES BRYCE, Author of *The Holy Roman Empire*, M.P. for Aberdeen. In Three Volumes. (London, 1888.)

THERE can be no question about the value and importance of Mr. Bryce's copious and elaborate account of the American Commonwealth. It bears ample evidence alike of the breadth of study on which it is based, and of the competence of its author to deal with so difficult a theme. It is conspicuously the work of a mind well furnished with stores gathered from literature, experience and travel. Apt in illustration, elegant in style, acute in observation, earnest in purpose, Mr. Bryce for the most part secures the unflagging interest of his readers throughout the two thousand closely-filled pages over which his work extends. His own entire sympathy with his subject is contagious, and we are lured into patient and even enjoyable discussion of such questions as those relative to the boundaries of federal and State rights, and other such dry topics, which in less skilful hands would be purely repulsive. We are impressed with Mr. Bryce's evident emotion as he con-

templates the present position and probable future of a people who after a century only of political existence already number sixty millions of prosperous citizens, and bid fair at no remote period to overshadow the puny civilization of the eastern hemisphere. In the dearth of trustworthy books on the political contemporary history of our kinsmen across the Atlantic Mr. Bryce's work supplies a desideratum which had been much felt in English literature, and will be welcomed by all students of political philosophy.

Whilst we make these laudatory remarks in no grudging spirit we must add that the excellencies of Mr. Bryce's book are qualified by serious disadvantages. The reader has reason to complain of its inordinate length, as well of the very unequal importance of the diverse and somewhat heterogeneous materials of which it is composed. We shudder on thinking of what the compass of the work would have been had Mr. Bryce's original purpose been carried out. Even in their present form these volumes might advantageously have been curtailed. Modern life is too complex for the exhaustive treatment in a single work of the various elements which compose it, and brief articles which might suit a monthly magazine, upon the churches and the clergy, railroads, the absence of a capital, and transatlantic oratory, and other disconnected subjects, rather distract the mind of the reader than contribute (as their author intends) to a more adequate presentation of the American Commonwealth. In our judgment the one chief failure of the book is the lack of a comprehensive and judicial summary of the whole case as it presents itself to the author's judgment. We have abundance of interesting matter and a long series of particulars. We have not the unity which sums up the evidence into well-digested conclusions, and leaves a clean-cut, well-defined impression stamped upon the mind and memory of the readers. The deficiency is doubtless caused by the comprehensiveness of Mr. Bryce's plan and the method he has adopted in fulfilling it.

'I shall endeavour,' he says, 'to omit nothing which seems necessary to make the political life and the national character and tendencies of the Americans intelligible to Europeans, and with this view shall touch upon some topics only distantly connected with government or politics' (i. p. 3).

The result is a sense of incongruity from the union under one title of essential matters whose treatment is exhaustive, succeeded by capriciously selected items, airily sketched in. 'Desinit in piscem mulier formosa superne.'

The constitution of the United States affords a subject for study in marked contrast to that of Great Britain and Ireland. Our own system is the growth of centuries, and presents all the complications and anomalies wrought by the most unsystematic modifications carried out upon no settled plan as the exigencies of time and circumstance have required. The constitution of the United States was drawn up after five months' deliberation by the Convention which met at Philadelphia in May 1787, and in audacious, yet wise, defiance of their instructions, framed an entirely new instrument, which was subsequently ratified by the several States. We sympathize with Mr. Bryce's high estimate of the magnitude of the task and the splendour of the result. The difficulties which beset the Convention were appalling. The inherent intricacy of their undertaking was aggravated by special causes of embarrassment. Divergent interests seemed irreconcilable. State was pitted against State in eager antagonism. So hopeless was the prospect of success that the veteran sceptic, Benjamin Franklin, then in his eighty-second year, proposed that as all human means of obtaining agreement seemed to be useless, the Convention should open its meetings with prayer; but it was feared that the adoption of his suggestion would betray the gravity of the crisis. Well might Hamilton, perhaps the ablest of the delegates, say: 'The establishment of a constitution in a time of profound peace, by the voluntary consent of a whole people, is a prodigy to the completion of which I look forward with trembling anxiety.'

The dominant conviction of those by whom the constitution was framed was intense distrust of authority. They dreaded above all things the encroachments of centralized power, and endeavoured to close every avenue through which it could possibly find or force an entrance. Hence the elaborate system by which the legislative, executive, and judicial powers were designed to counterbalance one another. Hence the studied recognition of the rights of each State as a separate 'community' and the corresponding restrictions upon the prerogatives of the Federal government. Hence the unwonted limitations imposed upon every person who should be entrusted with authority by the electorate. Hence the reference of so many offices, of all shades of importance, to direct popular election, and the very short periods for which their duties and responsibilities were committed even to the men who could command the suffrages of their fellow-countrymen. Local independence and the liberty of the individual citizen were the popular idols, and the instrument finally drafted, and

which  
force  
have  
Centr  
the pl  
of the  
ferenc  
stituti  
centra  
mulga  
by sub  
A very  
reader

The  
Bryce  
thirtee  
eight  
Europ  
munit

(1)  
with  
having  
impos  
admin

(2)  
Cabin  
High  
powers  
tion.  
limited  
such a  
of the  
power

(3)  
County  
official  
wider  
We ma  
Govern  
played.  
has su  
manag  
county  
and Ne  
such h

which with some slight modifications has ever since been in force as the constitution of the United States, would probably have been rejected as conferring excessive powers upon the Central Government, had its acceptance been determined by the plebiscite of the multitude instead of by the conventions of the several States. It was the dread of foreign interference which finally induced the States to ratify the constitution, and amendments designed to curtail yet further the central authority were passed within two years of its promulgation. How largely this sentiment has been modified by subsequent experience will be shown before we conclude. A very rapid outline of the constitution may be helpful to our readers.

The Republic, or Commonwealth, of America, as Mr. Bryce calls it, commenced in 1789 with a confederation of thirteen States. It now comprises thirty-eight States and eight Territories, which cover an area about as large as Europe. The complex political system by which these communities are governed consists of:

(1) Independent State Governments comprising a governor with other officers, a senate and a House of Representatives, having free legislative powers (save some slight restrictions imposed since the great slave war) as to all matters of internal administration.

(2) A Federal Government including the President with his Cabinet, Congress divided, as in the States, into two houses, and High Courts of Law. The Federal Congress has free legislative powers as to the particular matters assigned it by the constitution. These subjects are few, but important. They are strictly limited to the interests which all the States have in common, such as commerce, defence against a foreign foe, the control of the army and navy, the currency, the post office, and the power of making and levying taxes for these objects.

(3) Local Government authorities, such as City and County Councils, School and Highway Boards and their officials. These are more active, and are entrusted with wider powers than their corresponding bodies in England. We may observe in passing, that it is on the field of Local Government that the widest diversity of results has been displayed. In the rural districts of the older States, the system has succeeded in enlisting the best local ability for the management of what may be comprehensively described as county business. In the larger towns, such as Philadelphia and New York, it has been perverted by corrupt practices of such huge and scandalous dimensions as to arrest the atten-

tion and kindle the indignation of all who care for the maintenance of free institutions throughout the world.

As it would be impossible within the limits of our review to give even a condensed summary of the American system of government as described by Mr. Bryce, we propose first to call our reader's attention to the nature and working of the special measures by which the framers of the constitution endeavoured to secure the power of the democracy, and, secondly, to dwell upon some characteristic items of American political and social life. Throughout all discussion of such problems it should steadily be borne in mind that the conditions of the United States are so exceptional as to afford little or no illustration of the probable effect of similar institutions in any European country. It is hard to say whether of the two broad statements 'The Americans have made their country' or 'Their country has made them' contains the larger element of deceptive truth. Instead of endeavouring to determine so complex and intricate a problem, it will be at once more useful and more interesting to consider the special organization and development of the American democracy. The reliance of those who founded the American Commonwealth was based mainly upon three grand principles which they deemed of vital importance to the stability of freedom: namely, the maintenance of the sovereign right of the separate States, save as limited by the constitution; the careful separation and consequent restriction of the legislative, executive, and judicial authorities; and the brief tenure of office allowed to those elected to fill it.

The intention of its authors in framing the American constitution has been defined as the creation of an indestructible union of indestructible States. Each separate State was declared to be sovereign and its power over all communities within its limits to be absolute.

'It may grant or refuse local government as it pleases. . . . Massachusetts has lately remodelled the city government of Boston just as the British Parliament might remodel that of Birmingham. Let an Englishman imagine a county council for Warwickshire suppressing the municipality of Birmingham, or a Frenchman imagine the department of the Rhone extinguishing the municipality of Lyons, with no possibility of intervention by the central authority, and he will measure the difference between the American States and the local government of Western Europe' (ii. 13).

In the light of such an illustration we can understand the paradox so often repeated that there are no politics in the politics of America. Nearly all the great questions which

have a  
Ameri  
These  
accord  
marked  
of the  
compli  
exists  
enacted  
instanc  
others  
judges  
success  
enactm  
sions t  
constit  
constit  
hood s  
strong  
istic, th  
proper  
They h  
the lev  
more c  
of soci  
as yet  
Two pr  
constit  
what la  
constit  
hurry t  
people  
repres  
serious  
due to  
respect  
which  
have b  
of 'the  
The  
gaining  
the Am  
Nation  
the inh  
ship of



have agitated England during the last half-century would in America have fallen within the sphere of State legislation. These sovereign powers could, however, only be exercised in accordance with the popular will, and there has been a marked and growing disposition to narrow the competence of the legislature and to restrain its action by a variety of complicated restrictions. Considerable diversity naturally exists amongst the hundred and five State constitutions enacted since the Declaration of Independence. In some instances the powers of the executive have been enlarged; in others greater scope and independence has been given to the judges; in almost all an increasing list of subjects is on every successive revision withdrawn from the grasp of legislative enactment. It is difficult to sum up under general expressions the prevailing tendency of recent development of State constitutions without using terms that may mislead. All the constitutions are essentially democratic. In nearly all manhood suffrage prevails. Yet, broadly speaking, they display strong conservative characteristics. So far from being socialistic, they evince an eager desire to protect and guard private property. They show great jealousy of unnecessary change. They betray a distinct though very gradual reaction against the levelling movement of sixty years ago. How long these more conservative tendencies will prevail under the pressure of social problems which, although urgent in Europe, loom as yet but distantly in America, it is impossible to foretell. Two principal disadvantages attend the working of the State constitutions. One is the growing habit of amending in what lawyers term an unscientific manner the terms of the constitutions in order to enforce particular doctrines or to hurry through special reforms. Of course, the will of the people expressed in the constitution overrides that of their representatives embodied in any statute, and hence at times serious difficulty to determine whether obedience is or is not due to a statute. The other disadvantage is the lack of respect felt by the members of a State for a constitution which enjoys no prescriptive prestige, and whose terms may have been injudiciously tampered with through the influence of 'the Machine.'

These causes doubtless foster the national sentiment now gaining ascendancy in the United States, and which makes the Americans delight to call their Federal Government the National Government, and to claim a national unity, entitling the inhabitant of every State to pride himself on his citizenship of one great and powerful nation. This sentiment, which

has a valuable influence in converting the natural jealousy between neighbouring States into a wholesome rivalry, is blown every four years into fever heat by the excitement attendant upon the election of a President.

It is this dualism in the complex system of the American Commonwealth, this combination of unity with plurality, of centralization with decentralization, this federation of independent, democratic communities held together by the self-same sentiment that has developed and maintained the monarchical form of government in other countries, which make it so difficult to realize or describe the American system of government as a whole. May we not say that it is this dualism which makes it impossible for the people themselves to agree upon the importance to be attached to the several parts of their system? How can adequate importance be assigned to two nominally co-equal powers, towards each of which the allegiance of a citizen was equally due, but one of which could not fail to many persons to appear of vastly inferior moment to the other? When the State and the nation as represented by the Federal government were at variance, to which of the conflicting powers was obedience to be paid?

For it was inevitable that conflicts should sooner or later arise between the State and the Federal authorities, and it was no easy matter to determine which of the two could more justly claim to be acting within its right.

'Technically,' says Mr. Bryce, 'the seceding States had an arguable case; and if the point had been one to be decided on the construction of the constitution as a court decides on the construction of a commercial contract, they were possibly entitled to judgment. Practically, the defenders of the Union stood on firmer ground, because circumstances had changed since 1789, so as to make the nation more completely one nation than it then was, and had so involved the fortunes of the majority which held to the Union with those of the minority seeking to depart, that the majority might feel justified in forbidding their departure' (ii. 17).

The saying attributed to, but repudiated by, President Lincoln, that the South was upholding the constitution in order to break the Union, but that he would break the constitution in order to uphold the Union, aptly describes the situation. In fact a crisis had arisen which could not be determined by legal formulæ, and which was the resultant of many and various forces. Material and moral agencies were working to a common end. Steam and electricity had welded the separate States more closely together; had made the pressure and inconvenience of their mutually inconsistent legis-

lation upon business and the Federal Government should en- points and a thousand fusing the community, and patriotic pride. With the practical the Federal which Congress exercise, the American has become the great Sovereign.

We have farther ten power of interest of become a groupings, oppression, have in m those of the State com wealth; i Whatever American rate mem largely no existence

The s authoritie wealth, v the space be most which the own. T great part that party his Cabin administr

lation upon such questions as come closest 'home to men's business and bosoms' more palpably irritating; had engendered the necessity for such controlling central authority as should ensure unimpeded communication between distant points and across independent State areas; had, in short, in a thousand ways silently, but none the less surely, been fusing the inhabitants of the various States into one community, and almost unconsciously inspiring it with the patriotic pride of belonging to one vast and undivided nation. With the growth not merely of this sentiment, but of the practical necessities which strengthened it, 'the relation of the Federal power to the States and the amount of authority which Congress and the President are respectively entitled to exercise, have been the most permanently grave questions in American history with which every other political problem has become entangled.' The crisis was eventually reached in the great war of secession, which practically destroyed State Sovereignty and established Federal Government in its place.

We have not space to dwell upon other influences which farther tend to subordinate State and national feeling. The power of Washington is felt throughout the Union. The interest of State parties steadily declines, and 'national parties become all pervasive and leave little room for any other groupings or organizations.' To use Mr. Bryce's graphic expression, 'The State has shrivelled up.' Their legislatures have in many instances become hot-beds of corruption, and those of the largest States are confessedly the worst. The State commenced as an isolated and self-sufficing commonwealth; it is now merely a fraction of a far grander whole. Whatever importance was assigned by the founders of the American Commonwealth to the independence of the separate members of the Federal Union, that importance is being largely neutralized through the action of forces whose very existence could not possibly have been forecast.

The separation of the legislative, executive, and judicial authorities is a special feature of the American Commonwealth, whose description it is difficult to condense within the space of a few brief pages. Its peculiarities may perhaps be most clearly sketched by rapidly noticing some points in which the American system differs most widely from our own. The American people is broadly divided into two great parties—now termed Democrats and Republicans—and that party is said to be in power to which the President and his Cabinet (who at his nomination fill the chief posts in the administration) belong. But a Republican President may be

checkmated by a Democratic Congress, which he cannot dissolve, and which can carry measures despite his veto. His Cabinet Ministers do not occupy seats in Congress, nor exercise influence by initiating or carrying through any legislative enactments. The powers of the legislature and of the executive are defined by the constitution, and the interpretation to be put upon it in any disputed case is determined by the judges of the Supreme Court, who are themselves elected by popular vote, and have persistently in critical questions cast their judgment in favour of the political party which appointed them. We must not be understood as levelling any imputation at the honour or integrity of the judges of the Supreme Court. For legal ability and philosophical grasp of the principles of jurisprudence they have deserved and enjoyed the highest reputation. But it is one result of the American system that they may be said, through the authority entrusted to them of interpreting the constitution, to have the power virtually to override it; at least until their decision has been neutralized by the voice of the nation embodied in a constitutional amendment; and in one critical juncture, that of a disputed election to the Presidency, they adjudicated by a strictly party vote given, as is now generally acknowledged, for the candidate who had been fairly beaten at the poll. The Ministers who form the Cabinet and who wield the executive power are not responsible either to Congress or to the people at large, nor would a dozen votes of censure either compel them to resign, or the President, their master (to whom alone they are accountable), to modify his policy, provided that he acted within his constitutional rights. On the other hand, the President is personally responsible for his acts, and is liable to impeachment if he violates the constitution. Even strong party and personal hostility has not prevented American statesmen from remaining members of the same Cabinet. It would be hard to devise a more complete contrast to the principles which regulate British government, where ministers are jointly as well as individually responsible to Parliament, and must resign office as soon as they lose its confidence.

'In no European country is there any person to whom the President can be said to correspond.' He combines many of the functions of monarch, commander-in-chief by land and sea, prime minister, and universal dispenser of patronage. He enjoys more authority, if less dignity, than a king; more secure, if narrower, powers than a prime minister; a more absolute prerogative to employ force to put down insurrection, or to intervene in foreign affairs, than the states-

men of a  
lute disp  
any other  
check by  
impeach  
resorted  
cases of  
are calle  
'Abraha  
English  
hand, it  
tions ma  
Congress  
in the ai  
re-electi  
citizen w  
to sustai  
resuming  
ficed to s

We r  
cussion o  
Presiden  
the Pres  
against  
jealousy  
a Presid  
Common  
and the  
an indivi

Of th  
now cor  
They are  
are re-el  
325 men  
populati  
State, ho  
largest  
complex  
pressed f  
the inter  
functions  
alone in  
entrusts  
executiv

men of any constitutional European kingdom : a more absolute disposal of a world of patronage than falls to the lot of any other mortal. Misuse of these powers is only held in check by the pressure of public opinion and by liability to impeachment, an extreme course which has only once been resorted to,<sup>1</sup> and that ineffectually. It is mainly, however, in cases of exceptional emergency that the President's powers are called into exercise, and during the war of secession 'Abraham Lincoln wielded more authority than any single Englishman has done since Oliver Cromwell.' On the other hand, it must be remembered, that the President's nominations may be rejected by the Senate, his policy thwarted by Congress, and his annual messages be reduced to an idle shot in the air. At the end of four years, unless he can secure his re-election, the President subsides into the rank of a simple citizen without pension, without, it may be, sufficient income to sustain a dignified retirement, and without the power of resuming the professional or mercantile career which he sacrificed to serve the Commonwealth.

We must refer our readers to Mr. Bryce's pages for a discussion of the question why great men are not chosen to the Presidency, although so much, at a crisis, must depend upon the President's judgment, loyalty, and courage. The old cry against 'one man's power' is still heard, but despite the jealousy supposed to be inherent in democracies, the bolder a President the more popular does he become. As the Commonwealth grows larger, respect for an assembly declines, and the more is it attracted by the prestige that gathers round an individual man.

Of the two Houses which compose the Congress the Senate now comprises seventy-six members—two for each state. They are elected by the State legislature for six years, and are re-eligible. The House of Representatives, containing 325 members, is chosen for two years only, on the basis of population. It will be seen that in the former assembly every State, however small, possesses equal power ; in the latter the largest States exercise a preponderating influence. In the complex American system special admiration has been expressed for the indirect method of electing the Senate and for the intermixture of executive and judicial with its legislative functions. 'As respects these executive functions it stands alone in the world. No European State, no British colony, entrusts to an elective assembly that direct participation in executive business which the Senate enjoys.' Mr. Bryce's

<sup>1</sup> In the case of President Johnson.

verdict, however, is not favourable to so unique an innovation. Despite the fact that its continuity (a third of the members retire every two years, but are re-eligible) renders it far more attractive than the Lower House; despite the fact that it forms almost the only aristocratic element in the republic; the Senate has not escaped the contagion of political vice, and there is less respect for it collectively, and for its members individually, than there was eighteen years ago. Its powers afford opportunities for blackmailing of which unscrupulous men take advantage, and for which the transaction of important business in secret committee affords too convenient a screen. One purpose of the founders of the Commonwealth it has satisfactorily discharged. It is the conservative force of the constitution, and it checks the propensity of a single and numerous assembly to yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions.

The life and spirit of the House of Representatives are wholly different from those of our House of Commons, and its external aspect immediately and largely suggests this contrast. The size of the American chamber demands such physical effort as to exhaust all a speaker's powers, and intellectual action is impossible. What impression can the finest oratory produce upon a vast audience of men each seated before a comfortable desk, so that more than half the space is occupied by furniture, whilst huge galleries, capable of containing 2,500 people, absorb the utmost power of human lungs:—

'When you enter, your first impression is of noise and turmoil, a noise like that of short, sharp waves in a Highland loch, fretting under a squall against a rocky shore. The raising and dropping of desk-lids, the scratching of pens, the clapping of hands to call the pages, keen little boys who race along the gangways, the pattering of many feet, the hum of talking on the floor and in the galleries, make up a din over which the Speaker with the sharp taps of his hammer, or the orators straining shrill throats, find it hard to make themselves audible. I never heard American voices sound so harsh or disagreeable as they do here. Nor is it only the noise that gives the impression of disorder. Often three or four members are on their feet at once shouting to catch the Speaker's attention. Others, tired of sitting still, rise to stretch themselves; while the Western visitor, long, lank, and imperturbable, leans his arm on the railing, chawing his cigar, and surveys the scene with little reverence' (i. 189-90).

Under such conditions there is little good speaking or good business debating. A rattling exchange of pointed and compressed discussion is occasionally elicited when the House

rules the  
The pi  
such pu  
money,  
and bri  
fection  
eloquen  
not on  
Notwith  
higher  
joyed.  
for its l  
lican di  
defect is  
formity  
and mo  
monoto  
tions an  
and ma  
domina  
to guid  
promise  
as a cha  
to repre  
Represent  
ness as  
which t  
sibly av  
passed

One  
from the  
in its de  
money  
in Cong  
combina  
of bills  
of these  
compan  
withdra  
persons  
give per  
the war  
system  
of the m  
not even



rules that each speaker shall only be allowed five minutes. The principal interest centres round questions of taxation and such public works as it is proposed to subsidize with grants of money, and in connexion with the latter the arts of lobbying and bribery in their many forms have been carried to the perfection of a fine art. 'As a theatre or school either of political eloquence or political wisdom the House has been inferior not only to the Senate but to most European assemblies.' Notwithstanding these admissions, Mr. Bryce pleads for a higher estimate of its importance than it has generally enjoyed. Most Americans studiously decry it: the upper ten for its lack of refinement, the average citizen from a republican disinclination to acknowledge a superior. Its one fatal defect is that it presents a dead level of utterly uninteresting uniformity. It may be that its standard of manners, education, and morals is steadily rising, but it retains the same damning monotony. With but loose organization, without grand traditions and consequent *esprit de corps*, without leaders selected and maintained by a high sense of honour and responsibility; dominated by a desire adroitly to seize and follow, rather than to guide, public opinion; thronged with members whose promise of ability may be prematurely nipped by such a trifle as a change of residence—for no member is ever chosen save to represent the district in which he resides—the House of Representatives entirely lacks distinction. Such impressiveness as it produces is due not to the men, but to the interests which they embody, and the thought of the destiny that possibly awaits their fatherland ere another century shall have passed away.

One serious drawback to the prestige of the House arises from the languid interest felt not only in its debates, but even in its decisions. Keen as is the average American citizen in money matters, the discussion of important financial questions in Congress fails to command his attention. Many causes combine to produce this result. One is the enormous number of bills introduced every session, averaging over 7,000. Some of these are designed to attack railway and other commercial companies in the hope that their authors will be bribed to withdraw them. A very large number are promoted to satisfy persons having claims against the Federal Government, or to give pensions to men who served in the Northern army during the war of secession. Then, again, under the American system the minority is much more absolutely under the thumb of the majority than with us. The Speaker of the House does not even profess impartiality. He is elected by a purely party

vote, and is expected to exercise the large powers with which he is invested in the interests of his party. He appoints all standing committees and even nominates the chairman of each committee, so that he has entire control of the business of the House, and, although he must consult the important members of his own party in his selection, he wields 'an influence upon the fortunes of men and the course of domestic events superior, in ordinary times, to that of the President.' Then, again, the House is not a debating assembly. It does little more than register the conclusions arrived at in secret committee. Under such conditions all the interest awakened amongst ourselves by the elaborate criticism uttered in Parliament by able leaders of Her Majesty's Opposition, eager at once to refute their political opponents and to win public opinion to their policy—all the alternate flash of attack and repulse—is wanting in the House of Representatives. There is a yet further and more influential cause for public indifference in the composition of the House. No cabinet minister, no military or naval officer, no person in the civil service of the United States can sit. No lawyer in leading practice can afford to leave the city where his business lies to reside at Washington. Most pernicious of all in its effects upon the character of the House is the rule that no member shall represent any district save that in which he resides.

It would occupy more space than is at our command to follow Mr. Bryce's discussion of other causes which induce the most promising young Americans to prefer other walks in life to entering upon a political career. Further light will be cast on this matter when we come to speak of 'the machine.' In like manner we must pass by the mutual relations of the President and the Congress—of the executive and the legislature. The reader who wishes fuller information on these topics will find that they are treated with ample knowledge, with a wealth of illustration, with a clearness of thought, and a lucidity of style that penetrate to the core and unravel the intricacies of their complicated organization. But our rapid review of the constituent powers of the American Commonwealth would be incomplete without some notice of the Federal courts.

To the mind of some writers its judicial system is the most significant and distinctive element in the national government, and as worthy the special study of European statesmen. But Mr. Bryce explains that the exceptional position of the American Supreme Court is only the natural and inevitable result of the complex character of the American consti-

tution  
and  
attach  
Chart  
each a  
of Par  
Church  
the A  
ment  
was u  
positi  
ment  
statute  
Congr  
certain  
ing fo  
the co  
source  
consti  
In thi  
differ  
2. Fed  
It is e  
statute  
within  
stituti  
pretati  
the su  
wheth  
devolv  
Congr  
for the  
lawyer  
arises  
to the  
and F  
law-m  
stance  
these  
the au  
WI  
to the  
similar  
some v  
action

tution. With us there is no difference between one statute and another; all are of equal value. No special sanctity attaches to any enactment, however venerable. Magna Charta, the Habeas Corpus Act, the Bill of Rights, might each and all be repealed by a single measure in any session of Parliament. The argument that to disestablish the Irish Church—whose maintenance was one of the conditions of the Act of Union—was beyond the competence of Parliament met with scant attention when Mr. Gladstone's measure was under discussion. The Church, so far as its temporal position and property are concerned, the Throne, even Parliament itself, could constitutionally be abolished by a single statute. With us Parliament is supreme. 'In America Congress is doubly restricted. It can make laws only for certain purposes specified in the constitution, and in legislating for these purposes it must not transgress any provision of the constitution itself. The stream cannot rise above its source.' A like restriction is imposed by the several State constitutions upon the supremacy of the State legislatures. In this way there exist under the American system four different kinds of laws, viz.: 1. The Federal Constitution. 2. Federal Statutes. 3. State Constitutions. 4. State Statutes. It is evident that questions are likely to arise as to whether a statute passed by the Federal or by a State legislature lies within or beyond the purposes named or implied in the constitution, and to settle such disputes 'is a question of interpretation, that is, of determining the true meaning both of the superior law and of the inferior law, so as to discover whether they are inconsistent.' This interpretation must devolve on some court of law. Congress cannot do it, for Congress may be a party interested. Nor can the President, for the same reason; and moreover he is not necessarily a lawyer. The action therefore of the Supreme Court simply arises from the fact that the Federal constitution is superior to the Federal Congress, and that both Federal constitution and Federal statutes are superior to all State laws; that a law-making body must not exceed its powers, and that instances occur when the relative subordination and validity of these four different kinds of laws have to be determined by the authority of a supreme tribunal.

Whilst, however, no special powers have been entrusted to the Supreme Court such as would render the creation of a similar tribunal amongst ourselves a 'judicial safeguard,' as some writers have imagined, to our own constitution, yet its action and influence have gone far to justify the high admira-

tion of De Tocqueville and others. It has peacefully settled great constitutional questions in determining suits between private persons. It has provided a calm arena in which subjects calculated to inflame party passions could be settled after full discussion, and in the quiet atmosphere of philosophical jurisprudence. It has furnished a guarantee that the rights of the minority should not be swept ruthlessly away by the vehement impatience of the majority. It has been able largely to withstand transitory impulses. Of course it has not been faultless in its action nor infallible in its decisions; and Mr. Bryce suggests the means by which the security it affords would disappear if President and Congress agreed to swamp the bench with new judges pledged to uphold unconstitutional legislation. Such speculations lie outside our purpose, and it may suffice to say that probably no element of the American constitution displays more political sagacity on the part of its founders, or has deserved better of the Commonwealth in its action, than the Supreme Federal Court has done.

The third principle upon which the founders of the American Commonwealth relied for the maintenance of liberty was a short tenure of office and direct election by the people to the most important posts; any disposition to abuse the power entrusted to their rulers would, they thought, be effectually checked by compelling them at brief intervals to appeal to the popular suffrage; whilst nominations to inferior offices were but grudgingly allowed even to the highest ministers of State. The principles thus adopted for the Federal government were largely imitated in forming the State constitutions, at the same time that the custom of employing a well-educated and leisured class, such as in England formed the unpaid magistracy and conducted county business, was alien to the spirit of the American Republic. Hence there sprang into being a multitude of paid offices to be filled at frequent intervals by popular vote.

Among the most signal disadvantages of the American Constitution we should be disposed to place foremost this perpetual and unending recurrence of elections. The network of popular representation embraces such a minute variety of details, the positions which are filled by direct expression of the popular will are so numerous and diversified, the organization of the party machine is so carefully graduated and elaborate, the rewards of success are so manifold, ranging from the most trifling municipal office to the presidency itself, that political life might be—we should be

justific  
cease  
Engla  
one an  
cipal  
France  
Mr. Br  
the An

'In  
annual  
ennially  
decenn  
election

'In  
to two  
even wh  
... W  
this ma  
(ii. 434)

It i  
an esti  
dates f  
business  
professi  
or labor  
of such  
'All ou  
in Ame  
promot  
of elect  
Americ  
ticians,  
suffrage  
the Atl  
machine

To r  
practical  
held ou  
spoils'  
commen  
Preside  
the em  
masters  
was dec  
Republic  
VOL.

justified in saying, must be—spent by energetic leaders in one ceaseless turmoil of intrigue, struggle, and controversy. In England a citizen will not, on an average, vote more than one and a half times in a year, except in the case of a municipal contest; and the same average probably holds in France, Germany, or Italy. It is difficult, without quoting Mr. Bryce at some length, to convey an adequate notion of the American system. A condensed example must suffice.

'In the Great State of Ohio *seven* elections at the polls take place annually, *twenty-one* to *twenty-six* (according to circumstances) biennially, *eight* triennially, *two* quadrennially, *two* quinquennially, *one* decennially: giving an average in round numbers of twenty-two elections each year' (ii. 430-2).

'In New York City there are usually from one hundred and sixty to two hundred candidates to be voted for at the November elections, even when the year is not one when presidential electors are chosen.' . . . Well may Mr. Bryce add, 'It is hard to keep one's head through this mazy whirl of offices, elections, and nominating conventions' (ii. 434).

It is evident that an ordinary citizen cannot possibly form an estimate of the comparative merits of the various candidates for this shoal of offices. Occupation in some form of business is universal amongst the Americans. The learned professions or the money market, commerce or trade, literature or labour, absorb the time and energies of all to the exclusion of such a leisured and educated class as exists in England. 'All our men *do* something. Men of leisure would be despised in America,' has been frequently said to us. The lead in promoting party candidates and in securing the emoluments of elective offices, thus perforce neglected by the mass of American citizens, is assumed by a class of professional politicians, who have carried the art of manipulating universal suffrage to a scientific perfection unknown on this side of the Atlantic Ocean. This is effected by the agency of 'the machine,' an institution to which we shall shortly return.

To realize one of the most distinctive features of American practical politics we must explain that a further rich prize is held out to those who can carry the day, through 'the spoils' system. About sixty years since President Jackson commenced the plan of displacing on his election to the Presidency nearly all those who held Federal offices, from the embassies to European Courts down to village post-masterships. The proposal met with some opposition, but it was declared that rotation in office was a principle of the Republican creed, and a supporter of Jackson, Senator

Marcy, condensed the doctrine into the now famous expression 'To the victor belong the spoils.' The practice rapidly spread from the President to the other functionaries who in virtue of their office enjoyed the right of nomination to minor posts. With the prevalent American conviction that every man is good enough for any place that he can get, with the specious theory that rotation in office is essentially democratic because it gives every man an equal chance of salary and power, and with the hope inspired in the minds of two persons that they should each succeed to the office of which one person only would be deprived, 'the spoils' system rapidly extended and called into existence the class of professional politicians who have exercised so malevolent an influence upon American politics.

Let us endeavour to form some estimate of the extent and value of the stake for which the two great parties in the American Commonwealth contend. In England there are about fifty high offices which are vacated by a change of government, all other civil service appointments, if not for life, are not affected when a Liberal succeeds a Tory administration. With us, therefore, only an insignificant fraction of the whole population (and these for the most part men quite independent of their official salaries) has any pecuniary interest in the triumph of their party. In America there are 120,000 Federal offices open to professional politicians, besides the seats in the Senate and the House of Representatives, each of which commands a comfortable salary. There are many more than this number in the various States, the city municipalities, and the county councils, so that, at a moderate computation, the party in power commands the patronage of half a million of places, and deducting from this number those who do not make their official duties the main business of their lives, we shall have at least some 250,000 persons entirely dependent upon the profession of politics.

It must not be supposed that the emoluments of office form the most lucrative portion of the booty carried off by the victors. The ingenuity of the party wirepullers has devised schemes of official robbery gigantic in audacity and unparalleled in results. Mr. Bryce gives the details of some of the most notorious of these 'Rings,' and we select the Tweed Ring in the city of New York as a startling example of the height to which corruption and plunder could be carried through the agency of 'the machine.'

The object of the confederacy, of which William Marcy Tweed eventually became the recognized leader, was to obtain

the co-  
all co-  
purpos  
this ob  
upon h  
the bu  
the cit  
the cit  
another  
Ring.  
of forc  
countin  
corpor  
the off  
and al  
filled t  
restrict  
it was  
rateabl  
the leg  
public  
Ring a  
new str  
combin  
retainin  
of frau  
were in  
of those  
the con  
solidate  
derived  
they ha  
In the h  
were co  
should r  
up upwa  
was not  
when so  
*Times*, h  
and its c

'The  
amount t  
came into  
only \$ 20  
assessed  
the midd



the control of the finances of New York and the command of all contracts for new streets, public buildings, and similar purposes which might yield large and illegal profits. With this object the organization of the Democratic party was seized upon by skilful manipulation of the primaries, and this carried the bulk of the Irish vote, which is exceedingly powerful in the city. From the vantage thus secured one position after another was carried, until the city lay at the mercy of the Ring. No scruples restrained the victors. Illegal naturalization of foreigners, false registration, repetition of votes, unfair counting, were all employed. Its nominees controlled the corporation, the State legislature and the judicial bench, filled the offices of governor, mayor, city chamberlain, comptroller and alderman, and when more places were wanted created and filled them at the public expense. If a statute imposed any restriction upon the percentage of rate which could be levied, it was easily evaded by a new valuation which increased the rateable value of property in some cases a thousand fold. If the legislature had enjoined an official audit of any branch of public expenditure, the auditor was under the control of the Ring and passed whatever figures were set before him. If a new street were projected, the Ring was in the secret and combined to buy up ground which they resold to the city, retaining frontals of vastly increased value. If an accusation of fraud were brought against any of their friends, the judges were in their pay. Advantage was taken of the misconduct of those who had held office before the Tweed Ring gained the control to obtain a new charter for the city which consolidated their triumph. Not content with the profits thus derived they exacted forced contributions from those whom they had placed in office in order to extend their operations. In the building of a new courthouse for the county the frauds were colossal. It had been 'stipulated that the total cost should not exceed \$ 250,000 ; but before the Ring was broken up upwards of \$ 8,000,000 had been expended, and the work was not completed.' At length suspicion was awakened, and when some of the facts had been exposed in the *New York Times*, by a strenuous effort the Ring was swept from power and its chiefs brought to punishment.

'The following figures will give an approximate idea of the amount the Ring cost the city of New York. In 1860, before Tweed came into power, the debt of the city was reported as amounting to only \$ 20,000,000, while the tax rate was about 1.60 per cent. on the assessed valuation of the property in the city liable to taxation. In the middle of the year 1871 the total debt of the city and the county

—which were coterminous and for all practical purposes the same—amounted to \$ 100,955,333'33, and the rate tax had risen to over 2 per cent. During the last two years and a half of the government of the Ring the debt increased at the rate of \$ 28,652,000 a year' (vol. iii. pp. 194-5).

The iniquities perpetrated by the New York Tweed Ring surpassed in extent, but they did not greatly differ in character from abuses committed in most of the larger American cities. So complete a failure did self-government by universal suffrage prove that the powers of the municipalities were in many States largely restricted, and the citizens preferred that desirable improvements should be postponed to being subject to the evils which ampler powers had engendered.

We have yet to explain how it is that abuses in America have reached to such dimensions, and why it should be so hard to reform them. The key to the problem is to be found in the action of 'the machine.' In America the great moving forces are the two political parties—now termed Republicans and Democrats—into which the community is broadly divided. 'The Government counts for less than in Europe, the parties count for more, and the fewer have become their principles and the fainter their interest in those principles, the more perfect has become their organization. The less of nature the more of art; the less spontaneity the more mechanism.' We have already described what a multitude of places have to be filled annually by election, and we have set forth some of the reasons why the best men in America do not mix in politics. Add to these considerations the thought that in America the work of politics is to win elections, and the reader will in some degree comprehend the immense importance of an elaborate organization for securing and arranging the nomination of candidates. It is not the American custom for candidates to offer themselves for office. For anyone so to volunteer his services would be held a mark of presumption, and would almost inevitably incur defeat. The great point, then, is to ensure nomination on the list, put forth by one of the two great parties of candidates, for the several vacant offices. This list forms the party 'ticket,' and first to command the nomination on the ticket, and secondly to ensure the election of the candidate named upon it, is the work of 'the machine.'

It were long to describe the party organization. Its essential feature is that it is strictly representative. In the larger towns each ward, in country districts each township, has its committee, so that the network of the machine encloses the whole community. The meeting of each individual

dist  
pulle  
more  
enga  
make  
thus  
prima  
office  
office  
nomin  
trust  
of me  
fall is  
a vast  
increa  
towns  
gover  
orator  
saloon  
pack  
sans.  
suitab  
gethe  
of 'th  
and in  
that o  
regula  
differ  
railwa  
TH  
inferio  
politic  
and th  
to the  
a spar  
which  
faculti  
genera  
his ow  
enemy  
this un  
central  
the me  
each o  
trains

district is called a Primary, and here the work of the wire-pullers begins. The smaller offices, though attractive to the more needy, are not so important as to interest men actively engaged in business, so the primaries are easily packed to make the nominations for such minor posts, and the footing thus gained is gradually extended. Delegates from the primaries are sent to the nominating conventions for State offices, and 'few men of good social position think of the office of delegate (except to the National Convention for nominating to the Presidency) once in four years, as one of trust or honour.' The evil of entrusting power to the class of men into whose hands it is under such conditions likely to fall is largely aggravated in the greater cities, which contain a vast population of ignorant immigrants. As the population increases, each man's acquaintance with the bulk of his fellow-townsmen, as well as his interest in the details of local government, grows smaller. An active man, with popular oratorical gifts, soon gathers a following from the drinking saloons and other 'lewd fellows of the baser sort,' and these pack the primaries and carry the nomination of their partisans. Men of independent mind who wish to propose more suitable candidates find themselves outvoted or even altogether excluded from the primary. Thus the whole weight of 'the machine' is exerted on behalf of the party candidates, and independent action is placed at so great a disadvantage that one writer says that the difference between running as a regular candidate and running on your own account is like the difference between travelling by railway and making a new railway of your own.

The interest of all other elections is, of course, greatly inferior to that for the Presidency, in which the foremost politicians are eager to serve on the nominating convention, and the arts of management and combination are raised to the highest pitch of tactical refinement. Mr. Bryce gives a sparkling account of the nominating convention at work, which bears out his assertion that scarcely greater are the faculties of combination and coolness of head needed by a general who has to bear in mind the position of every one of his own corps, and to divine the positions of those of the enemy's corps which remain concealed, and who does all this under the roar and through the smoke of cannon. A central position such as Cincinnati or Chicago is selected for the meeting of the nominating convention by the leaders of each of the Republican and Democratic parties. Special trains convey each 'State delegation,' which acts under its

chairman, and is expected to vote 'solid' in most States. Amidst the tumult and turmoil of a thousand delegates the convention is opened and the struggle begins. Candidate after candidate is proposed. Ballot after ballot is taken. Those who hold the most prominent places at the outset are so far from being secure of victory that adroit managers are only watching for the favourable moment so to unite opposing sections in favour of some Dark Horse or Favourite Son as to upset the most carefully reasoned calculations. For example, in the Republican convention of 1880 Mr. Garfield was not voted for at all on the first ballot, and up to the thirty-fourth received only two votes. On the thirty-sixth he was nominated by 399. As soon as the majority is clearly established it is usual for all other competitors to withdraw, so that the nomination may be unanimous. Amidst a scene of the wildest excitement the successful candidate is proclaimed the choice of the whole party. From the scene of the nominating convention, Chicago or elsewhere, the news is telegraphed in every direction. For three months the most self-contained and cool-headed people go mad with enthusiasm over the election of a man whose name they may have never before heard. Mass meetings are held. Parades of voters, many thousands strong, march through the streets of the great cities, and a battalion of lawyers, merchants, and brokers, regardless alike of wind and rain, will tramp in endless lines, singing a political refrain whose intellectual calibre falls below that of a negro melody, to listen to an harangue from their adopted candidate.

To this rapid sketch of the distinguishing principles of the American constitution, and some of the more salient and characteristic practices to which they have given birth, we should have liked to add some notice of Mr. Bryce's elaborate discussion on the formation and influence of public opinion, and also some of the miscellaneous topics gathered in the last portion of his work. The chapters which treat of social institutions appear to us of very unequal merit. Probably our own religious convictions prevent our attaching much importance to Mr. Bryce's views on the churches and the clergy and the influence of religion. To the consideration of each of these most intricate and difficult questions Mr. Bryce devotes twenty out of his two thousand pages, and we may be excused from regarding such *obiter dicta*, uttered by an avowed partisan of the American system, as being worthy more than this passing mention. In the chapters which treat of the bench and the bar Mr. Bryce is on more familiar ground,

His o  
tween  
and se  
been o

In  
trast to  
its jud  
Court,  
a rank  
the ju  
that th  
person  
quately  
very di  
so wide  
in the  
honour  
tively  
remem  
tenure  
exist i  
may ha  
liable t  
so scar  
the the  
judges  
in Eur  
with fa  
ception  
English  
a god  
'ownin  
If to ta  
in a ru  
one wh  
whole l  
New Y  
the city  
for me  
son I s

The  
view of  
enter, b  
at the  
women

His own conclusions are not favourable to the identity between the two branches of the legal profession—the barristers and solicitors—which obtains in America, and which has been of late much urged amongst ourselves.

In nothing perhaps does America present a stronger contrast to England than in the character and social standing of its judicial bench. The Federal judges of the Supreme Court, indeed, occupy an exceptional position, and enjoy a rank in dignity and public esteem on a level with that of the judges of our own High Court of Justice, and the fact that the other Federal judges hold office for life secures persons of integrity and ability, although they are inadequately paid. But with the great mass of State judges it is very different. There are, of course, many exceptions. Over so wide an area, and under such diverse conditions as prevail in the thirty-seven States, there are instances of the spotless honour and scrupulous impartiality which we assume instinctively as the attributes of an English judge. It should be remembered that the circumstances of appointment and tenure of office are altogether different from those which exist in this country. Elected by popular suffrage, which may have been manipulated by some ring or powerful boss, liable to removal from office at the expiration of a few years, so scantily paid that lawyers in large practice would scorn the thought of accepting such stipends, how can American judges generally obtain the social high position they command in Europe, or the respect of those who practise in their courts with far superior legal knowledge? All the world over exceptional talent will gain the mastery, and we have heard an English chancellor compared to Jeroboam because he set up a god in Bethel, but we never heard of an English barrister 'owning a judge,' as we are told has occurred in America. If to take part in a shooting affray or to issue an injunction in a rum shop without even reading it over be possible for one who sits upon the bench, we need not wonder if the whole body is at times subject to unjust suspicion, or that a New York merchant should say of one of the chief judges of the city, 'He's not at all a bad fellow, and would do anything for me at a moment's notice, but, of course, he's the last person I should dream of asking to my house.'

There are other tempting subjects embraced in Mr. Bryce's view of social institutions on which we should have liked to enter, but which deserve fuller discussion than can be accorded at the close of an article. The influence and position of women; the question of Female Suffrage; the wild speculating

spirit of Wall Street, which revels in gigantic combinations, and deals in land schemes and gold mines on so colossal a scale as to captivate the imagination, and occasionally to make a fortune at a stroke; the distinctive characteristics of American Universities and other educational institutions with which the land is being rapidly overspread; the probable direction and development of American creative intellectual power; the tone and style of American oratory; the pleasantness of American life—each and all of these in turn exercise their influence on national character, and present special points of national idiosyncrasy that are worthy of study. We must, however, turn aside from these lighter topics to devote our concluding paragraphs to a brief consideration of some deeper, more general, and more serious questions, in which we may sum up the impression stamped on our mind by these most interesting volumes.

It is impossible, we think, in any degree to realise the bearing of the facts detailed by Mr. Bryce, or adequately to estimate the magnitude of the issues which depend upon the success or failure of social and political institutions in America, without feeling the deepest interest in asking, What is the probable future of the American commonwealth? and What is the light her experience affords towards the solution of those social problems which lower so ominously on the horizon of Europe? For the position of America is unique in the history of nations. The world has seen no similar example of a people which has sprung at a bound into full maturity without passing through the centuries of alternate fortune by which existing European nations have been gradually developed. With no great military despotism advancing upon her borders; with no envious neighbour to regard her progress with timorous or angry jealousy; with a boundless territory for the expansion of her growing population; with a climate so varied and salubrious as to render her independent of the products of other nations—'Ipsa suis pollens opibus, nihil indiga nostri;' with all the arts of civilization gathered around her cradle; born in the full light of Christian truth, brought up in the free atmosphere of unrestrained liberty, and heir to the painfully gathered social and political experience of ancient and modern history—what people ever entered the community of nations with such singular advantages as the American Commonwealth? It is in no narrow or carping spirit that we ask whether the success of her political institutions has been proportionate to the advantages she has enjoyed? He would be a bold man who

would  
and to  
such a

It  
which  
likely  
temper  
no co  
eviden  
future  
mourn

'Wi  
and a h  
the peo  
country  
evils pr  
depress  
that wh  
masses  
seek vic  
for the

Th  
bias, by  
fluence  
but its  
what i  
Americ  
been g  
Harris  
with th  
of his c  
system  
of muc  
curred,  
to be c  
resist s  
authori  
the opi  
of Ame  
viction  
be put  
which r  
the bes  
politics  
made p



would venture to answer this question in the affirmative, and to assert that her political temper and training have been such as to prepare her for seasons of anxiety and trial.

It might be supposed that the full tide of prosperity which has flowed in America in such ample volume was not likely to slacken for many generations to come. The hopeful temperament so characteristic of Americans at least indicates no consciousness of approaching danger. But Mr. Bryce evidently does not share in this sanguine forecast of the future in store for the American Commonwealth, and he mournfully asks—

‘Will the progress now discernible towards a wiser public opinion and a higher standard of public life succeed in bringing the mass of the people up to the level of what are now the best districts in the country before the days of pressure are at hand? Or will existing evils prove so obstinate, and European immigration so continue to depress the average of intelligence and patriotism among the voters, that when the struggle for life grows far harder than it now is, the masses will yield to the temptation to abuse their power, and will seek violent and, because violent, probably vain and useless remedies, for the evils which will afflict them’ (iii. 662).

The answer to these questions will be shaped by political bias, by hopefulness of temperament, and by many other influences which act almost unconsciously upon the judgment; but its value will largely depend upon capacity to distinguish what is merely temporary from the permanent direction of American policy. The hopes of civil service reformers have been greatly disappointed by the course which President Harrison has adopted of distributing offices in accordance with the recommendations of the representatives and senators of his own (the Republican) party. The return to the spoils system is in this way so qualified as to relieve the President of much of the responsibility and anxiety he formerly incurred, but it only casts them upon those who are less likely to be conscious of high moral obligation and less able to resist sectional claims by shielding themselves behind the authority of the highest national functionary. It is, however, the opinion of many competent judges that the present phase of American administration is temporary, that a strong conviction is spreading throughout the country that an end must be put to the prevailing system of bribery and corruption which now permeates every branch of the executive, and that the best men must and will take a more practical part in politics, will insist upon the staff of the civil service being made permanent as well as being appointed for personal

fitness and not for party expediency, and will not rest until the Government is delivered from the corrupt influences of rings and bosses, and placed at least upon as satisfactory a footing as that which it holds in the foremost countries of Europe.

To the further question, What light does the experience of America afford towards the solution of European social problems? we should probably return an answer less flattering to the great American Commonwealth than Mr. Bryce would render. It is true that he recognizes the difference of social and political conditions which make American experience of little value in the Eastern hemisphere. It is true also (and should be in all fairness remembered) that the great Commonwealth has passed triumphantly through a season of fiery trial, and has emerged from the terrible war of secession immeasurably strengthened. But despite the impartiality and frankness with which Mr. Bryce allows faults and failures in American institutions, his work as a whole implies a far more favourable verdict upon them than we have heard from the lips of any well-informed American citizen. Is it too much to say that whilst the healthy, hopeful tone of the people of the United States is well worth our imitation, her distinctive institutions do not supply the ideal for European statesmanship? With all our faults, Englishmen need not be ashamed either of the motives by which their rulers are inspired, or of the means by which they strive to accomplish their aims.

---

#### ART. VI.—A ROMAN PROSELYTE ON ANCIENT CHURCH HISTORY.

*Dependence: or, the Insecurity of the Anglican Position.*

By LUKE RIVINGTON, M.A. (London, 1889.)

WE presume that the Roman Church authorities in this country have, at any rate provisionally, accepted Mr. Rivington, a 'convert' of last year, as a controversial theologian and apologist. In the discharge of this function he has made several excursions into the wide field of ecclesiastical history; and some results of these researches have appeared in a book called *Authority*, and in a smaller production not inappropriately called *Dust*. In the former of these attacks on the position which he had held and abandoned, Mr. Rivington

heap  
ship,  
that h  
were,  
tradit  
made  
that t  
start f  
as if t  
context  
of the  
Papac  
airily  
Papal  
pellets  
Firmil  
into th  
Englan  
himsel  
fervid  
chair o  
deliber  
of *Aut*  
our pag  
us, sha  
illustra  
the rela  
history

<sup>1</sup> Me  
*De Unit*  
exordium  
Petrum  
as if it w  
originem  
call St. I  
words ne  
is charac  
writes, 'C  
Church'  
*principal*  
<sup>2</sup> The  
Roman 'C  
shortly be  
prove tha  
always co  
<sup>3</sup> We  
scholarly  
ferences.

heaped up passages touching on a Petrine 'primacy' or leadership, as if they proved a Petrine supremacy; and assumed that high claims made by Roman bishops about their own see were, as such, trustworthy evidence of a primitive Catholic tradition. He quoted St. Cyprian as saying that Christ made Peter the *origo* of unity, whereas Cyprian really says that the *origo*, the beginning of apostolic authority, took its start from Peter.<sup>1</sup> He argued from Cyprian's *De Unit. Eccl.* 3, as if the 'head' there mentioned were the Pope, whereas the context shows it to be Christ; mistook 'the root and womb of the Catholic Church,' in another Cyprianic passage, for the Papacy, whereas it means the Church as a mother; he talked airily of Cyprian as having been 'restive under the exercise of Papal authority in one important matter,' and discharged little pellets at the 'miserable and disgraceful letter' of St. Firmilian; he compressed his view of the case of St. Meletius into the smartly laconic dictum, 'St. Meletius never rebelled: England did,' as if Meletius ever by word or deed owned himself to be Rome's subject<sup>2</sup>; and he insisted on Jerome's fervid professions, at thirty years of age, of devotion to the chair of St. Peter, as if they were not to be balanced by more deliberate language used in later life. These are but samples of *Authority*. Of *Dust* some notice has already been taken in our pages; and Mr. Rivington's third work, now lying before us, shall at present be considered simply as affording fresh illustrations of his unfitness for instructing us Anglicans on the relation between modern Papalism and ancient Church history.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Meaning that the authority was first promised to him. See Cypr. *De Unit. Eccl.* 4, 'Unitatis ejusdem originem ab uno incipientem . . . exordium ab unitate proficiscitur'; *Ep.* lxx. 3, 'Una ecclesia . . . super Petrum origine unitatis . . . fundata,' which Mr. Rivington translated as if it were 'Petrus originem'; *Ep.* lxxiii. 7, 'Petro . . . unde unitatis originem instituit.' On this latter passage he not only made Cyprian call St. Peter, not the symbol, but the source of unity, but omitted the words next following about the commission given to all the Apostles. It is characteristic of Mr. Rivington's method that in *Dependence*, p. 52, he writes, 'Rome, according to St. Cyprian, was the principal or ruling Church'—the words 'or ruling' being simply his own gloss on Cyprian's *principalem*.

<sup>2</sup> The language used by St. Basil, Meletius's friend, in reference to Roman 'superciliousness,' is well-known; *Ep.* ccxxxix. That Meletius, shortly before his death, adopted a Roman synodical formulary does not prove that he was in actual communion with Rome. In fact, Rome always consistently disowned him as Bishop of Antioch.

<sup>3</sup> We intentionally pass over some indications of a loose and unscholarly manner of handling ancient documents, e.g. in regard to references.

But first, as to the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem; Mr. Rivington repeats and expands the statements made in his former book.<sup>1</sup> 'Many Anglicans,' he complacently remarks, 'appear to misunderstand the whole passage in Acts xv.; and he proceeds to inform us that a meeting was held at Jerusalem to welcome St. Paul and St. Barnabas; that at a second meeting, consisting of apostles and elders only, 'it was probably decided that St. Peter should deal with the dogmatic question'; that Peter, as supreme over all concerned, authoritatively introduced the subject at a third meeting, at which the laity were present, and obtained a hearing for Paul and Barnabas; that when St. James afterwards spoke, it was not as if presiding over the assembly, but as connected with the Judaizing Christians. But if St. Peter was the Pope-Apostle, the teacher, the pastor of the Christian flock as a whole, why is not that fact represented in the narrative and in the wording of the final decree? Mr. Rivington ascribes St. Peter's own reticence on this head to his apostolic humility and considerateness: but on Papalist principles, he might surely have been expected, on such an occasion, to magnify his office in mere fidelity to Him whose vicar, in a wholly unique sense, he was.<sup>2</sup>

We come to the great Ecumenical Councils. But first

<sup>1</sup> We do not, indeed, find him explicitly asserting, as in *Authority*, pp. 69-71, that St. Paul was a 'novice-Apostle' in the scene of Gal. ii. 11; that he admonished St. Peter as St. Bernard admonished Pope Eugenius III.; that the question was of 'personal conduct or practical expediency' (i.e. we presume, that no principle was at stake); and that St. Peter gave the sentence at the Council of Jerusalem, which was subscribed by the rest, first by St. James.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rivington in this chapter refers to a pamphlet which we have not seen, and in which his previous explanation of St. Chrysostom's language on this Council is called in question. We freely admit that Chrysostom is exuberant on the theme of St. Peter's eminence among the Apostles; that he goes beyond St. Luke's lines in saying that 'Peter permitted the question to be moved, and then spoke'; and that the word *ἐκείνος* in *Hom. in Act. xxxiii. 2* ought not, according to the received text, to be rendered 'James,' as in the *Library of the Fathers*. But Mr. Rivington misunderstands some expressions of Chrysostom's, as if Peter's speech had not contained matter 'unwelcome' to persons with a Judaizing tendency; and does less than justice to the significance of Chrysostom's comment on St. James's *ἐνὶ κτίσει*, 'It means, With authority I say that this is so,' and of his statement that James thus *ἐξέλασε τὸ πᾶν*, and that *κοινὸν τὸ δόγμα γίγεται*. Mr. Rivington also imagines that *τοῖς περ' ἐκείνων* in Chrys. *De Sacerd. ii. 1* means the Popes; but it refers to all bishops. He quotes from the Homily *In illud, In faciem*, where St. Peter, as the spokesman at Pentecost, is called *αἴτιος* of all that followed. He slips in the word 'responsible' as a gloss on 'cause'; but he does not give the illustration, from a soldier striking the first blow in a battle—which limits the 'responsibility' in the case.

let us  
Riving  
Pontifi  
whole  
over a  
the ar  
moral  
moral  
fallibil  
in the  
formal  
ther, i  
develo  
the ve  
the Va  
sacro a

It  
this wi  
therefo  
to the  
eminen  
or whi  
Ultran  
for Mr  
cally m  
field, w  
can pr  
substan  
this at  
content  
fashion  
mits to  
that La  
tian bo  
are ver  
point in  
spect, t  
Celestin

In c  
Consta  
position  
Chalced  
(p. 49)  
which t  
has not

let us clearly state the belief as to Papal authority which Mr. Rivington has bound himself to hold. It is that the Roman Pontiff has 'full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, a power ordinary and immediate, extending over all and singular pastors and believers, and embracing the area of discipline and government, as well as of faith and morals'; and that 'when he defines a doctrine on faith or morals to be held by the whole Church, he possesses the infallibility with which Christ willed His Church to be endued in the act of thus defining, so that his definitions are irreformable *ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ*'; and further, it is part of the same belief that this is no additional development, but represents 'the tradition' received 'from the very beginning of Christianity.' Such are the words of the Vatican decree, *Pastor Æternus*, promulgated by Pius IX., *sacro approbante Concilio*.

It is all-important to bear this in mind. Nothing less than this will satisfy the existing Roman requirements. Evidence, therefore, which makes for less than this is evidence irrelevant to the issue. Language or acts which at most import an eminence, a leadership, a primacy of influence or of honour—or which import a claim of some supremacy short of the full Ultramontane standard as above set forth—are of no value for Mr. Rivington's purpose, however much he may economically make use of them. He is nowhere in the argumentative field, with regard to Patristic or Conciliar evidence, unless he can produce what is equivalent, we do not say verbally, but substantially, to the decree of 1870. That decree has done this at least for us—it has swept the stage clear of all such contentions as might have satisfied the requirements of old-fashioned or 'moderate' Romanism. Anyone who now submits to Rome, or who advocates her actual 'claim,' must hold that Leo XIII. is the absolute monarch of the whole Christian body, that his decisions *ex cathedra* on faith and morals are veritable oracles of the Holy Spirit, and—which is the point immediately before us—that what he is now in this respect, that was Clement I., or Sylvester, or Innocent I., or Celestine I., or Leo I., each in his own day.

In one passage Mr. Rivington says of the Pope: 'Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus had brought out the reality of his position more and more clearly; but it was reserved for Chalcedon to emphasize the headship more clearly still' (p. 49). 'His position,' it will be observed, must be that which the Vatican decree defined; on Roman principles he has not, and never had, any other. Did 'Nicæa,' then, bring

out the reality of his absolute jurisdiction and his *ex cathedra* infallibility? We are inclined to marvel that a Papalist should venture to name Nicæa at all. If the Vatican decree is true—and for Mr. Rivington it is the voice of God—then the Bishop of Rome in 325 had just the same rights, and just the same responsibilities in regard to their exercise, as the Bishop of Rome in 1870.<sup>1</sup> And was there ever, in the whole range of Christian history, a fitter occasion for such exercise of rights, or rather for the discharge of such solemn and urgent duties, than was the Arian controversy? Yet no one invoked Sylvester of Rome to decide that momentous question *ex cathedra*; it never occurred to him to put forth his gift of infallibility for the suppression of a theory which denied his Master's real Godhead; instead of this, it was deemed practically necessary to bring together the representatives of a worldwide Episcopate, and in their assembly his deputies did not even take the leading part. Did the Church of 325 ignore what Pius IX. was made to call an aboriginal tradition? or did Pius IX.'s predecessor in 325 betray, by not asserting, the tremendous function committed to him by Christ? It is hardly worth while, after this, to notice the interpretation put by our author on the sixth Nicene canon: 'The Nicene fathers . . . said in effect, *Rome has set the example of subordinating* certain sees to certain others: let Alexandria and Antioch continue in their similar groove.' This, of course, is a quiet way of suggesting that Rome had introduced the usage by her own unique authority. The canon, we need not say, implies nothing of the kind. There was an old affinity between the Churches of Rome and Alexandria, and hence it was natural to quote the case of the former as illustrating the reasonableness of the position to be secured for the latter.

But did the Second General Council 'bring out' still 'more clearly' the sovereign 'position' of the Pope? In a very curious manner; it was held apart from him, without his co-operation, without the presence of any Roman delegate. Mr. Rivington says of its third canon, 'Although the Papal legate had seemed to recognize its new position, that third canon never obtained œcumenical acceptance.' An ill-informed reader might possibly infer that a 'Papal legate' attended at Constantinople, but we understand Mr. Rivington to mean that

<sup>1</sup> In *Authority*, p. 56, Mr. Rivington remarked that if the papal office of 'universal teacher and head of the Church be divine, we should expect that those who hold it would be made aware of its divine institution.' Certainly we should.

at Chal  
lius of  
aquiesc

The  
us that  
Celestin  
had con  
letter, d  
the doc  
present  
mission  
the Cou  
in a cer  
he was  
Alexand  
procured  
Council,  
sentence  
prepared  
Cyril to  
Arcadiu  
Bishop o  
Celestin  
proxy, a  
Thessalo  
'the sac  
Nestoriu  
against  
formal a  
Celestin  
which 'co  
the Rom  
received  
Western  
'Petrine  
ecclesiast  
to recon  
interest

<sup>1</sup> Mans

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* i

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* i

'appropriat  
torius; and  
Mr. Riving  
applied by  
as a fellow-



at Chalcedon the 'legates' acquiesced in the claims of Anatholius of Constantinople to take rank next to themselves—an acquiescence for which Hefele suggests a reason.

Then as to the Council of Ephesus. Mr. Rivington tells us that this synod, 'in accordance with the judgment of Pope Celestine, presided over by his legate St. Cyril of Alexandria, had condemned Nestorius . . . had, in obedience to the Pope's letter, deposed Nestorius.' If Mr. Rivington had really read the documents, he would not think this a fair account to present to persons unacquainted with them. First, the commission given by Celestine to Cyril had nothing to do with the Council; it was given nearly a year before, in order that in a certain contingency Cyril might signify to Nestorius that he was severed from the communion both of Rome and of Alexandria. This was done. But Nestorius had already procured from Theodosius II. the summoning of a General Council, which *ipso facto* suspended the operation of this sentence; and Celestine and Cyril made the best of it, and prepared for the Council. Celestine did not commission Cyril to represent him at Ephesus, but sent three legates, Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip. Pending their arrival, the Bishop of Alexandria presided, 'occupying *also* the place of' Celestine—that is, claiming, not unreasonably, to hold his proxy, as Flavian of Philippi 'held the place of' Rufus of Thessalonica.<sup>1</sup> Next, the deposition-sentence, combining 'the sacred canons' with a previous letter of Celestine to Nestorius, must be taken together with the anathemas uttered against Nestorius before that letter had been read, with the formal announcement to Nestorius, which does not allude to Celestine, and with the synodical letter to the emperors, which 'commends' Celestine for his orthodox zeal.<sup>2</sup> Further, the Roman delegates, arriving after the deposition, were received as representing not Celestine only, but the whole Western episcopate.<sup>3</sup> One of them, certainly, used the high 'Petrine' language which was matter of course with Roman ecclesiastics; at the same time it is more than difficult to reconcile Celestine's own language about the common interest of all bishops in the apostolical teaching office.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, iv. 1123.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *ibid.* iv. 1177, 1228, 1240.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 1300.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* iv. 1283. The legates might well be declared to have spoken 'appropriately' or 'consistently,' in that they pronounced against Nestorius; and Cyril described them as 'assenting' to the Council's decision. Mr. Rivington quotes 1 Pet. v. 1, as apposite to the term 'fellow-minister' applied by the Council to Celestine. Did the presbyters speak of St. Peter as a fellow-presbyter?

with the Vatican doctrine *de Romani pontificis infallibili magisterio*.

And now let us come to the subject on which Mr. Rivington accepts battle with a flourish of trumpets—the bearing of the Council of Chalcedon on the case between England and Rome. He undertakes to show that Anglicans have no ground for appealing to its authority. Let us consider. After the condemnation of Eutyches by the local synod of Constantinople, and the assent of Leo to that decision, ‘the cause of Eutyches was espoused by the Patriarch of Alexandria, Dioscorus, and the Emperor Theodosius was enlisted in their cause. A General Council was suggested, and St. Leo consented.’ He did so, although thinking that no Council was really needed, and wishing that, at any rate, the Emperor had given him longer notice;<sup>1</sup> for it appears more than once in the course of these proceedings that the initiative of a General Council did not rest with the Bishop of Rome. Leo wrote his inestimable ‘Tome’ for the assistance of the Council on the great doctrinal subject involved; but he insisted in various letters that the question was not whether Eutyches should be found orthodox or heterodox, but whether he would retract his ascertained error. Characteristically enough, Leo construed the Eutychianizing Emperor’s invitation to a Council as intimating a desire to learn from St. Peter in his successor what was the import of Matt. xvi. 16;<sup>2</sup> and he assumed, according to the standing Roman policy of assumption, that the Council would content itself with simply acting on the lines which he traced out. After what Mr. Rivington, truly enough, calls the ‘catastrophe’ of the Latrocinium, Leo entreated Theodosius to summon another and larger Council, to be held in Italy, and suggested that, until then, the *status quo ante* should be maintained.<sup>3</sup> He set the Western court to urge this on Theodosius.<sup>4</sup> In vain; the Emperor upheld the Latrocinium. Again, in July 450, Leo wrote to Theodosius, and also urged that Anatolius, the successor of Flavian, should study the letter of Cyril to Nestorius, and ‘not disdain also to read over his [Leo’s] own letter,’ *i.e.* the Tome. He told Pulcheria that what he asked of Anatolius was simply, ‘ut Cyrilli . . . epistolæ . . . acquiescat, *vel* epistolæ meæ . . . consentiat.’<sup>5</sup> Suddenly, on July 28, 450, the scene changes: Theodosius dies; Pulcheria espouses Marcian, and ‘he at once,’ Mr. Rivington tells us, ‘expressed his willingness to convene a Council at Leo’s bidding.’ The Greek phrase, σου αὐθεντοῦντος, or the

<sup>1</sup> Leo, *Ep.* xxxvi., and xxxi. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Epp.* xlv., liv.

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* xxxiii.

<sup>4</sup> *Epp.* lv.–lviii.

<sup>5</sup> *Epp.* lxix., lxx.

Latin  
that of  
that a  
means  
did not  
a reply  
entered  
question  
tried to  
not wis  
which s  
the Eas  
be held  
almost  
since yo

The  
are told  
graded  
and Dic  
bold. T  
manded  
brought  
out, or  
ruled th  
middle;  
and held

The  
the Coun  
would be  
pronounc

<sup>1</sup> ‘Obscurationem n . . . Concilii petiit, clem

<sup>2</sup> Cf. L.

<sup>3</sup> *Epp.*

in his *Hist.*  
the summon  
If the letter  
we are told  
had taken h  
grounds, an  
Leo ‘profes  
zeal which p  
hend, has n  
ecclesiastica  
<sup>5</sup> Exactly  
Theodoret,  
VOL. XX

Latin version, 'te auctore,' is here misused. Leo's tone had been that of a petitioner;<sup>1</sup> and Marcian now intimated his desire that a Council, supported by Leo's authority, might be the means of securing peace on the basis of true faith. But Leo did not now want a Council. He kept Marcian long waiting for a reply. In fact, the Emperor had to write thrice before Leo entered on the subject;<sup>2</sup> he then assumed that the doctrinal question was settled, and a few weeks later in another letter tried to get the Council deferred.<sup>3</sup> The fact was, that he did not wish for any Council unless it could be held in Italy; which shows that he was by no means sure of his hold over the East. But Marcian was resolute that the Council should be held in the East, and Leo submitted, saying in effect, almost plaintively, 'I asked you to defer the Council, but since you will not, I submit—only let the faith be secured.'<sup>4</sup>

The Council meets at Chalcedon. 'The Papal legate,' we are told, 'demands that the Patriarch of Alexandria be degraded from the seat he had taken. He insists on obedience, and Dioscorus retires to the middle.' This is just a little too bold. The Acts tell us what happened. The legates demanded that Dioscorus should not be present until he was brought in 'to be heard' as an accused party. 'Let him go out, or else we will go out.' The imperial commissioners ruled that he should be present, but sitting by himself in the middle; and the Roman legates 'sat down in their own places, and held their peace.'<sup>5</sup>

The 'Tome of St. Leo' was, as we all know, accepted by the Council of Chalcedon. But was this acceptance such as would be required, on Vatican principles, for an *ex cathedra* pronouncement on faith by a Pope? That is the question.

<sup>1</sup> 'Obsecro . . . sacerdotes supplicat . . . obsecramus . . . supplicationem nostram . . . postulationem . . . petitionem oblatam a Leone . . . Concilium universale intra Italiam, sicut synodus . . . mecum petiti, clementia vestra concedat,' &c. Little enough of 'bidding' here!

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Leo, *Epp.* lxxiii., lxxvi., lxxvii.

<sup>3</sup> *Epp.* lxxxiii.

<sup>4</sup> *Epp.* lxxxix., xc. Mr. Rivington complains of Canon Bright for saying in his *History of the Church* that 'Leo was vexed by the promptitude of the summons,' and adds, 'There is no ground for this in the saint's letters.' If the letters are read, the vexation, we conceive, will be apparent. Again, we are told that 'Canon Bright's remark, that Leo, finding that Marcian had taken his own line, professed to ascribe it to a pious zeal, rests on no grounds, and is unworthy of the Professor.' But it is literally true that Leo 'professes,' in *Ep.* xc., to 'ascribe' Marcian's insistence to 'a pious zeal which puts divine affairs above human.' Mr. Rivington, we apprehend, has not read many ancient letters addressed to potentates, civil or ecclesiastical.

<sup>5</sup> Exactly the same position was assigned, in the same session, to Theodoret, when received as an accuser who might be accused.

Mr. Rivington answers it in the affirmative. His argument is, that in the second session some bishops declared that they had already signed the Tome; and that on its being read the cry arose, 'Peter hath spoken thus by Leo'; so that when it was agreed that some difficulties found in the Tome by certain prelates should be elucidated in a conference, and, later still, the bishops individually declared their acceptance of it, this was not a case of 'reviewing and confirming'<sup>1</sup> the document, but simply of securing an intelligent adhesion to what was *ab initio* binding on the Council. Here, then, is the point: on Mr. Rivington's view the Tome was *de fide* for all Christians from the moment of its promulgation in June 449; no bishops, either before the Council of Chalcedon or during its sittings, were competent to 'review' it or to withhold their submissive assent. Simply because it came *ex cathedra* from Leo, it was to be received, apart from all inquiry about its merits, as the teaching of Peter, as the oracle of the Holy Spirit. But this theory will not stand with the facts. The prelates who said that they had previously, and not in Council, signed the Tome, and those who on hearing it read broke forth into the famous acclamation, meant that they themselves personally approved of it, and held it to be intrinsically in accordance with the mind of St. Peter. 'Piously and truly,' they added, 'has Leo taught: so taught Cyril.'<sup>2</sup> And this is made further evident by the long series of individual declarations of acceptance which fill so many columns in the record of the fourth session.<sup>3</sup> Their general result is that the bishops approve the Tome *because* they believe, or have ascertained, that it is in harmony with the Creed and with the teaching of Cyril. To represent themselves as 'simply bowing to the authority of St. Peter speaking through Leo,' and not exercising any true personal judgment, is really to falsify the record. We repeat, then, deliberately, that the Council, as such, did pronounce judg-

<sup>1</sup> This is Canon Bright's expression, which Mr. Rivington considers to be unwarranted.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rivington betrays his ignorance of the historical situation by suggesting that the object was to prove Cyril's teaching to be accordant with Leo's. It was exactly the reverse. There was in many minds an apprehension that by adopting the Tome with its assertion of Two Natures they would be abandoning Cyril's contention for the One Person of Christ. It was a mistaken fear, but it had to be dealt with.

<sup>3</sup> See Mansi, vii. 9 ff., and compare the various phrases expressive of examination and judgment. 'We have proved—I have ascertained—I am convinced—I am assured—I perceive no inconsistency—According to my apprehension—It agrees,' &c. Some profess themselves satisfied with the oral explanations which have been given. They assent to the Tome *because* of its orthodoxy thus proved.

ment  
with a  
Ar  
in con  
senten  
votes t  
with th  
varied  
decision  
acquitt  
extortin  
then, a  
judgme  
which a

As  
prise th  
points in  
the lega  
absence,  
that full  
that Chu  
When th  
a shout a  
of prelat  
the prop  
legates re  
menced v  
versy, and  
he does no  
mistic ac  
Latin vers  
was corrup  
usual scep  
the hypoth  
imperial s  
interpolati

<sup>1</sup> Mansi,  
Leo and Ana

<sup>2</sup> Mansi,

<sup>4</sup> This is

which seem  
true text, and  
respect for R  
an exposure,  
Mr. Rivington  
as Nicene a c  
On this see G

ment on the merits of the Tome, and approved it *as* accordant with already established standards.

Another grave misrepresentation is to say that the Synod in condemning Dioscorus acted simply in obedience to the sentence of Leo as announced by his legates. Anatolius votes the deposition of Dioscorus because he 'entirely agrees with the Apostolic see,' and the other bishops do the like in varied forms of expression—not as merely registering the decisions of an absolute chief.<sup>1</sup> Again, although Leo had acquitted Theodoret of heterodoxy, the Council persisted in extorting from him an express anathema against Nestorius; then, and not till then, misgivings were silenced, and Leo's judgment was hailed as godly.<sup>2</sup> Here again was a case in which a Roman decision was 'reviewed' and *then* 'confirmed.'

As for the twenty-eighth canon, we observe without surprise that Mr. Rivington has omitted some rather important points in its story. He does not tell his readers that when the legates protested against what had been done in their absence, the Archdeacon of Constantinople openly declared that full notice had been given them of business affecting that Church, and that they had declined to take part in it. When they suggested that the signatories had been coerced a shout arose, 'No one was coerced'; and afterwards a number of prelates in succession stated their reasons for accepting the proposed new canon.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Rivington tells us that 'the legates read a version of the sixth Nicene canon, which commenced with a sentence that had no bearing on the controversy, and which was not in the Greek *version*.' We suppose he does not like to say, the Greek original; and after this euphemistic account of an attempt by the legates to pass off a Latin version, which they may have deemed accurate, but which was corrupt, and that in the Roman interest, he resorts to his usual scepticism as to whatever tells against Rome, and favours the hypothesis that the passage in the acts which represents an imperial secretary as reading the true Greek text is in fact an interpolation.<sup>4</sup> Again, he is silent as to the formal 'interlo-

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, vi. 1048 ff. Several prelates in their brief speeches mention Leo and Anatolius together.

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, vii. 189.

<sup>3</sup> Mansi, vii. 425 ff., 441, 447.

<sup>4</sup> This is suggested by the Ballerini, and adopted by Hefele, for reasons which seem to us very weak. It was distinctly *ad rem* to produce the true text, and thus to damage the case of the legates; at the same time, respect for Rome would restrain the bishops from commenting on such an exposure, which would be in fact what Canon Bright calls it, a 'rebuff.' Mr. Rivington should remember that Leo had already (*Ep.* xlv.) claimed as Nicene a canon which had been notoriously proved to be *not* Nicene. On this see Gore's *Leo the Great*, p. 114.

cutor' of the commissioners, supported by the applause of the bishops, in favour of the canon, and as to the direct rebuff administered by the commissioners to the legate who demanded, 'Cancel the canon, or let our protest be entered on the minutes.'<sup>1</sup>

But what happened afterwards? Did not the Council address Leo as 'their head—as the appointed guardian of the Vine and interpreter of the words of Peter'? They did so: they wished to keep on good terms with him; they hoped to obtain his assent to the canon;<sup>2</sup> and so Marcian afterwards asked him to 'be so good as' to assent to and confirm the canon, in his quality of president of the Synod. His tone is not that of humble 'entreaty'; he professes some surprise that Leo has not promptly confirmed all the proceedings of the Synod;<sup>3</sup> a few phrases of his, applauding Leo's zeal for the ancient canons, are eagerly caught up by Leo as implying acquiescence in his reiterated rejection of the new one, on the ground of its deviation from Nicene lines.<sup>4</sup> Anatolius, whom Mr. Rivington imagines as, with Marcian, 'on his knees before the Pope,' complains to Leo of the conduct of the legates, and urges him to express his own assent.<sup>5</sup> Not till 454 does Anatolius promise 'obedience,' and declare that the validation and confirmation of all the acts is reserved to Leo, who thereupon accepts his professions, and exhorts him to be content with the limits traced by ancient canons.<sup>6</sup> And when Mr. Rivington tells us that after this 'nothing more transpired concerning the canon, no further appeal was made to it at that time, and it was omitted from the authorized

<sup>1</sup> Mansi, vii. 453. They justly appreciated his theological excellence, and believed that he had been true to the duty of the first bishop in Christendom in presence of a pestilent error.

<sup>2</sup> 'Canon Bright,' says Mr. Rivington, 'speaks of this letter as carrying diplomatic courtesy to an excess. There is really no ground for this statement.' Mr. Rivington apparently has not read the sentence: 'Your legates attempted to gainsay what we had decreed, *no doubt from a wish that this benefit should originate from your thoughtful care.*'

<sup>3</sup> Leo, *Ep.* cx.

<sup>4</sup> See Leo, *Epp.* civ., cxv. Mr. Rivington says that Leo laid stress on his own office as the official guardian of the Nicene canons. Yes; but in one place he also says, 'The Nicene fathers live in their constitutions, *et apud nos et in toto orbe terrarum*' (*Ep.* cvi.). And, by taking his stand upon the Nicene canons, he showed that he did not think it prudent to say plainly, 'Your draft-canon compromises the sacred dignity of my see, and therefore I disallow it.' He had felt more free in dealing with the Western emperor, into whose mouth he put a statement claiming the authority of a Council for the 'ruling' supremacy of the Roman bishop. 'No such synod,' says Dr. Littledale, 'had ever existed so far, and Leo knew it' (*Petrine Claims*, p. 227).

<sup>5</sup> *Ep.* ci.

<sup>6</sup> *Epp.* cxxii., cxxv.

collecti  
suppres  
did not  
stantin  
protecti  
Rome,  
never ex  
stateme  
contradi  
perman  
Rivingt  
which h

In re  
by his o  
of 418  
part of  
by the P  
for their  
of cano  
replied t  
inquiry a  
to this in  
canons t  
series as  
really Sa  
would su  
that syno  
thereupon  
famous, a  
admitted  
that Rom  
he adds,  
priests an  
to you,' t  
chooses, i  
object to  
legate (p.  
'that the  
the rights  
for the dis  
they had a

<sup>1</sup> 'Const  
Alexandria,  
in 1215, but  
xvi. 174).



collection of canons even in the East,' he goes near to *suppressio veri* in not adding, after Hefele, that the Greeks did not adhere to their professions, and that Bishops of Constantinople continued to act upon the new canon under the protection of their Emperors, and in despite of the protests of Rome, which could not go on indefinitely, although Rome never explicitly approved the canon: we may add the terse statement of Liberatus, 'Licet sedes apostolica nunc usque contradicat *quod a synodo firmatum est* imperatoris patrocinio permanet quoque modo.'<sup>1</sup> 'The canon invalidated,' as Mr. Rivington calls it from the Roman standpoint, is the canon which has practically prevailed.

In regard to Apiarius the case is this, that being deposed by his own bishop he appealed to Rome; the African Council of 418 thereupon forbade all appeals beyond sea on the part of clerics. Pope Zosimus, the same who was deceived by the Pelagians, sent three legates to Africa; they claimed for their master a right to receive appeals on the score of canons described by them as Nicene. The Africans replied that they would respect these canons pending an inquiry as to their genuineness. St. Augustine was a party to this inquiry, which was made in the East, and proved the canons to be *not* genuine. (In fact, they were part of the series ascribed to the Council of Sardica; but if they were really Sardican, their due publication throughout the West would surely have prevented St. Augustine from confounding that synod with its Arianizing rival.) The African bishops thereupon sent to Pope Celestine a letter which has become famous, and of which Mr. Rivington ventures to say that it admitted 'the principle of appeals to Rome,' but only desired that Rome would not act 'prematurely or against rules,' and he adds, as if translating, 'And you ought to reject the priests and other clergy who are *so rash* as to have recourse to you,' the words being *improba refugia*. Mr. Rivington chooses, in defiance of fact, to assume that they did not object to a final appeal to Rome, but only to the action of a legate (p. 227). Let us hear Hefele: 'They affirmed,' he says, 'that the receiving of appeals at Rome was an attack upon the rights of the African Church.' They never said a word for the distinction invented by our author. Some years before they had absolutely forbidden all appeals from Africa; in the

<sup>1</sup> 'Constantinople was allowed' by Rome 'to take precedence of Alexandria, though not on the score of this canon,' not for the first time in 1215, but at the so-called Eighth General Council, of 869 (Mansi, xvi. 174).

present letter they emphasize this contention, and give reasons for it. Three pages further, Mr. Rivington says that 'certain bishops wrote to Pope Celestine in strong terms,' but not mentioning Rome; and he represents them as objecting merely to appeals made before the African Council had heard the case. Their language, we repeat, covers much broader ground than that of a mere plea for a local court of first instance. Mr. Rivington hints a doubt as to the genuineness of this letter, which is the same that he had quoted above. If it is genuine, he is sure that it is only the utterance of a small Council, not, as Tillemont, Henry, and Hefele represent it, according to its title, of the Council of Africa. It contains a protest against the employment of 'men in power' to enforce a Roman decision, as this would be an 'introduction of the smoky pride of the world into the Church'; and it was exactly this which St. Augustine had deprecated, in a letter of entreaty to Celestine, the year before this Council. Tillemont remarks, somewhat caustically, that if the Pope had not listened to Augustine 'justice might have been obtained' by the action of the Council itself. Mr. Rivington quotes many passages from St. Augustine, but seems hardly to appreciate the value which he would naturally find in Roman support or concurrence as against the Donatists or the Pelagians. Fairly interpreted his words do not go beyond the idea of pre-eminence or of leadership, as belonging to the only 'Apostolic See' in the West—to the see of the Apostle who was the especial symbol of unity—and when Mr. Rivington quotes him as contemplating an application to the African Council, and then, if necessary, to Rome, but omits the words which follow, 'that the right course for us to pursue (in a question of discipline) may be settled *communi omnium auctoritate*,' he is in fact garbling his quotation.

We will add a little to what appeared in our July number in regard to the cases of Liberius and Honorius I. Mr. Rivington follows Hefele in rejecting the letters ascribed to Liberius in the 'Fragments' of St. Hilary's historical treatise. We grant that there are difficulties attaching to the letters;<sup>1</sup> but Mr. Rivington not only sweeps them aside, but in a similarly cavalier fashion disposes of the statement of Sozomen<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g., the Fragments make Liberius sign some Eastern and strongly Arian creed made at Sirmium, yet of which Semiarians were part-authors. This will not suit the 'Blasphemia' of Sirmium.

<sup>2</sup> Here, and not here only, he indicates the second-hand character of his information. He tells us that Sozomen 'expressly' says that owing to confusion of the narrations before him 'he is not to be considered a liar if he is *discovered* to be wrong in his narration.' But, in fact, Sozomen

as erro  
of tho  
to con  
easy.  
Liberi  
sion.<sup>2</sup>  
reckles  
but en  
docum  
but a r  
returne  
his wis  
of Feli  
in Ath  
such ci  
says is  
deliber  
rius,' th  
fact th  
bishops  
remind  
later, t  
Nicene

implies t  
There is  
that Lib  
man, Dö  
Fragmen

<sup>1</sup> As  
eyes 'ar  
Memoria  
famous l  
was four  
to the pa  
ventures  
in Ath.  
could not  
written.  
do not s  
reasoning  
Socrates  
not wrong  
Athanas  
the end o  
statement  
on the Ro  
<sup>2</sup> Hil.  
of the Ro  
who had  
<sup>3</sup> See

as erroneous, of the passages in St. Jerome as certainly, and of those in St. Athanasius as probably, spurious.<sup>1</sup> It is easy to construct Church history on this method; but then it is *too* easy. In a passage quite indisputable, Hilary implies that Liberius purchased his restoration by some wrongful concession.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Rivington, while on this theme, appears wellnigh reckless; he starts with treating Liberius' fall as 'not proven,' but ends by assuring us that he 'either signed a harmless document or none at all'; he calls Liberius not only a confessor, but a martyr; he tells us that according to Socrates Liberius returned to Rome 'by the emperor's leave, but contrary to his wish,' whereas what Socrates says refers to the expulsion of Felix;<sup>3</sup> and that, on the hypothesis that one of the passages in Athanasius is genuine, Athanasius treats 'a signature under such circumstances' as of 'no value,' whereas what the passage says is that what men do under torture does not express their deliberate intention. As for 'St. Ambrose's praise of Liberius,' the Benedictine editors reasonably attribute it to the fact that he *pulchre lapsum reparaverat suum*; and Eastern bishops just emerging from Semiarianism were not likely to remind Liberius of a bygone humiliation, when, eight years later, they asked him to recognize them on the basis of Nicene belief.

implies such an imputation would be based upon *ignorance* (i. 1). There is nothing intrinsically improbable in Sozomen's statement (iv. 15) that Liberius signed a Semiarian compilation. It is accepted by Newman, Döllinger, and Hefele. It bears less hardly on Liberius than the Fragments do, but it still makes him untrue to Nicæa.

<sup>1</sup> As for Jerome, the passage in the Chronicle is in Mr. Rivington's eyes 'an addition from an untrustworthy source, the preface to the Memorial of Marcellinus and Faustinus.' (He is wrong in making the famous letter to Damasus synchronize with the date of the Chronicle; it was four years earlier.) Then he quietly affixes the adjective 'supposed' to the passage about Liberius's fall in the *De Viris Illustribus*. But he ventures beyond Hefele in this, and also in casting doubt on the passages in Ath. *Apol.* 88 and Ath. *Hist. Ar.* 41, and even thinks that Athanasius could not have added those passages after the books as a whole were written. It was just what Athanasius would do. See Hefele, s. 80. We do not see that the Greek is unlike Athanasius's style, or that the reasoning is unlike his; and Mr. Rivington's argument from the silence of Socrates and Theodoret is highly precarious. The date in Athanasius is *not* wrong, but right, if Liberius was exiled early in 356, and abandoned Athanasius's cause (the point on which Athanasius gives testimony) in the end of 357 or the opening of 358. We must notice one astounding statement of Mr. Rivington's; it is that 'Athanasius triumphed, standing on the Rock' of St. Peter's see!

<sup>2</sup> Hil. c. *Const.* 11, alluding to Liberius's return. The orthodox zeal of the Roman people might not prevent him from welcoming Liberius, who had specially endeared himself to them.

<sup>3</sup> See Soc. ii. 37; and Tillemont, vi. 437.

Honorius, we are assured, did not 'issue an *ex cathedra* decree' on the Monothelite question. The chapter is headed, 'Honorius declining to define,' and it is admitted that herein he was wrong—that he erred through 'negligence.' Now, as to the doctrinal drift of his letters to Sergius; he not only exhorted that patriarch to discourage both phrases, 'one activity' or 'two activities,' but further actually denied the possibility of a human will which was also sinless in the Incarnate.<sup>1</sup> Was not this a grave error, which at any rate came very near heresy? And his letter was a solemn official document, issued in reply to a solemn official consultation. It is therefore, as Renouf says, a 'mockery' to deny it to be *ex cathedra*.<sup>2</sup> Then, as to the anathemas pronounced by the Sixth General Council, Mr. Rivington ventures to say that they do not 'attribute to Honorius any personal heterodoxy.' This is most disingenuous. The Council plainly says that Honorius's letter 'followed the false doctrines of heretics'; that he 'confirmed the impious dogmas of Sergius'; it calls him, *simpliciter*, 'heretic'; it anathematizes him 'together with' the Easterns whom he 'followed in this matter.'<sup>3</sup> It is really pitiable trifling to say that 'heretic' as applied by a Council to other patriarchs would imply personal active heresy, but would mean only 'remissness' as applied to a Pope. Some of Leo II.'s words, 'negligendo confovit,'<sup>4</sup> are claimed as stating the whole case; but Leo also imputed to Honorius a 'profane betrayal.'<sup>5</sup> And the assertion that 'subsequent Councils and Pontiffs joined only in Leo's condemna-

<sup>1</sup> See Mansi, xi. 539. He assumes that a human will as such must be vitiated, must be antagonistic to God's will; and such words of Christ as appeared to involve a human will in His manhood he interprets as merely a didactic accommodation. Of course, he clearly affirms Two Natures. See Hefele's account of his letters.

<sup>2</sup> Renouf, *On the Condemnation of Pope Honorius*, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Mansi, xi. 553-6, 621, 665. In the last passage there is no real 'distinction' drawn between Honorius and the others. If *ὁὐν αὐτοῖς* precedes his name, *ἐν δὲ καὶ* precedes that of Cyrus. Mr. Rivington tries to reduce *γνώμη* in the conciliar sentence to 'the wish [of Sergius]'; but the Latin translator rightly renders it 'mentem.' We may here notice a point urged by Mr. Rivington about Pope Agatho. In his letter he asserted that his predecessors had ever faithfully strengthened their brethren. Mr. Rivington says that this was read in the Council 'without demur.' The Council proceeded to contradict it most effectively by anathematizing Honorius as heretical.

<sup>4</sup> Leo II. to Spanish Bishops, Mansi, xi. 1052.

<sup>5</sup> To Constantine, Mansi, xi. 731. Elsewhere, 'traditionis regulam . . . maculari consensit,' Mansi, xi. 1057. He is here saying that 'all the authors of the heretical assertion, being condemned by the Council, have been cast forth from the unity of the Church, that is, Theodore, Cyrus, . . . and together with them Honorius of Rome, who,' &c.

tion  
false,  
nothi  
butin  
to 'ch  
shows  
of his  
It  
that t  
with f  
to ma  
read u  
been t  
exten  
has be  
like a  
Mr. R  
throw  
influen

A.

1. The  
ju  
on
2. Can

FOR th  
have pl  
the Chr

<sup>1</sup> See  
Mr. Rivi  
strugglin

<sup>2</sup> See  
*Popes*, E.  
Cyrus .  
Council  
Honorius  
fession of  
assertions

<sup>3</sup> The  
in the 5th  
plique le

<sup>4</sup> Grat

tion, not in the language of the excited bishops,<sup>1</sup> is simply false, if it means, as we suppose it does, that they imputed nothing more than 'negligence' to Honorius;<sup>2</sup> while in attributing the excision of the condemnation from the Breviary<sup>3</sup> to 'charity' in view of 'perverse misunderstanding,' our author shows that a 'Roman proselyte' can lose not only the sense of historical truth, but also all perception of the absurd.

It was a noble and truth-loving French priest who declared that the question of the Infallibility was 'totally gangrened with fraud.'<sup>4</sup> We are far from thinking that the temptation to manipulate facts, to misinterpret the purport of events, to read unwarrantably between the lines of documents, has never been too strong for Anglicans or for Protestants. But the extent to which, and the persistency with which, this method has been pursued by Roman advocates, amounts to something like a moral 'sign' against a system that  *eget tali auxilio*. To Mr. Rivington we impute no conscious sophistry; but he has thrown himself into an atmosphere which is thick with noxious influences—and we see the result.

#### ART. VII.—METROPOLITANS AND THEIR JURISDICTION.

1. *The Guardian* for May 15, 1889. (Containing report of the judgment delivered in the Archbishop's Court, Lambeth, on May 11.)
2. *Canones Conciliorum*. Edidit BRUNS. (Berlin, 1839.)

FOR thirteen centuries the prelates of the see of Canterbury have played a great and representative part in the fortunes of the Church of England. For half that time Lambeth Palace,

<sup>1</sup> See also p. 82, 'passionate vehemence.' These phrases betray Mr. Rivington's soreness about a General Council whose action he is struggling to minimize.

<sup>2</sup> See P. Gratry, *First Letter*, and Döllinger, *Fables concerning Popes*, E. T. p. 231. The 'seventh' Council 'rejects Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus . . . as averse from true religion,' Mansi, xiii. 377. The 'eighth' Council 'anathematizes Sergius and Pyrrhus . . . and with them Honorius, together with Cyrus,' &c., Mansi, xvi. 181. The Popes' profession of faith condemned Honorius as having 'fomented the unsound assertions' of the Easterns.

<sup>3</sup> The name of Honorius once stood with those of Sergius and Cyrus in the 5th lection for June 28. 'C'est à ces sortes de *fraudes* que s'applique le texte de Job, *Numquid indiget Deus mendacio vestro?*'—Gratry.

<sup>4</sup> Gratry, *Second Letter*.

whose story was so vividly sketched by the facile pen of the late J. R. Green, has formed a picturesque stage for their action. Nor is the part allotted to the archbishops of less moment to-day than in the past, nor the scenes witnessed by Lambeth less historic. Many fateful assemblies have met there, but few so pregnant with result as the three great councils, of which the third and largest met a year ago under the wise and statesmanlike guidance of the present Primate. More than one famous trial has brought archbishop and bishop, metropolitan and suffragan, face to face within its walls. Here Pecocke appeared before Chichele, and Bonner before Cranmer, and Watson before Tenison. Yet the present trial of the Bishop of Lincoln bids fair in absorbing interest to surpass them all. The main encounter is to come, and of that, *pendente lite*, it would not be in place to speak; but even the preliminary fencing had an importance of its own. The Bishop's protest raised, and the Archbishop's judgment of May 11 decided, an issue which involved the whole question of the judicial functions of the Metropolitan. It was argued on behalf of Dr. King that the only constitutional machinery for a bishop's trial was, according to the ancient canons of the Church, the synod (represented in the Church of England by the Convocation) of the province. It was affirmed by Archbishop Benson that, whether or no alternative methods existed, judicial rights over his suffragans were inherent in his metropolitical office according to canon law in general, and according to the law of the Church and realm of England.

There cannot be more than one opinion as to the clearness, consistency, and ability of the Archbishop's judgment. 'As between the ecclesiastical lawyer and the theologian, it looks as though the theologian had the best of it,' was the verdict of a daily newspaper. And whatever view we take of the conclusion reached, we may well be thankful for the keen consciousness displayed of the continuity of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Bishop of Lincoln's protest was far from being based on any personal objection to Archbishop Benson as judge. On the contrary, there have been few individual prelates, certainly no primates, of the modern English Church from whom, as instinct with historical Christianity and as qualified by specific knowledge, we have a better right to expect an impartial hearing and a decision which will carry weight. But the present case will be a precedent, and perhaps an epoch-making one. A prosecution may be as easily instituted for doctrinal as for ritual offences. At the mercy of any successor—possibly of an unworthy successor—

of th  
cour  
Chur  
func  
be sa  
tions  
when  
right  
spirit  
mode  
herita  
morro

W  
and t  
bered  
which  
(the a  
of ass  
of jur  
acts,'  
Archb  
presen  
which  
upheld  
Since,  
hearin  
necess  
and re

Our  
definit  
Archbi  
metrop  
recepti  
Nor sh  
individu  
ocume  
In oth  
politica  
the can  
these, a  
law, the  
time an  
admiral  
the doc



of the Primate would lie the verdict of the highest spiritual court in jurisdiction over the chief spiritual officers of the Church of England, and in matters touching their chief function as guardians of the Apostolic tradition. Should it be said that we are not justified in hypothetical representations of obscure possibilities, we answer that that is so only when we have taken all such precautions against them as are right and reasonable. So soon as we have built up our spiritual judicature on constitutional principles and primitive models, and have shown ourselves not unfaithful to our inheritance, then, and not till then, we may safely leave the morrow to 'take thought for the things of itself.'

We are bound, then, to test in these lights the judgment and the court it creates; and in doing so it must be remembered that the Archbishop was really a party to the issue of which he was the judge. If it was true that 'their lordships' (the assessors) 'could not be called on to discharge the office of assessorship, properly speaking, in considering the validity of jurisdiction which potentially affects themselves and their acts,' the same would seem to be in a measure true of the Archbishop himself. At any rate, the fact remains that the present constitution of the ultimate spiritual court before which an English bishop may be called upon to plead was upheld, and objection to it overruled, only by the court itself. Since, then, the reconsideration of the judgment by a fresh hearing elsewhere cannot be secured, no apology will be necessary for an attempt to subject some measure of its facts and reasonings to unauthoritative criticism.

Our intention in the following pages is to cover only a definite and limited amount of the field traversed by the Archbishop. We do not propose to touch the history of metropolitan jurisdiction in England, or the extent of the reception in England of the canon law of the Church at large. Nor shall we even discuss the process by which the canons of individual councils have attained an œcumenical or quasi-œcumenical, and therefore in some sense permanent, authority. In other words, while dealing with the history of metropolitan jurisdiction in the early Church, and especially with the canons of councils from Nicæa to Chalcedon, although these, as a matter of fact, formed the basis of the later canon law, they will be adduced here only as evidence for their own time and place. Archbishop Benson speaks, indeed, with admirable force and point of the general contrast between the doctrinal and disciplinary authority of the Councils.

'The creeds and sacred definitions deal with things eternal. The canons and the discipline deal with things of spiritual concernment, but in temporal regions and for temporary uses. The canons themselves take into account the conditions of their own times and countries. . . . The institutions, organizations, and usages of communities, both ecclesiastical and civil . . . have been in perpetual movement and life, and those canons as they stand do not now answer to the actual practice of any Christian Church.'

Yet if we show, as we shall try to do, that the jurisdiction now claimed violates not only in method but in substance, not only in expression but in principle, the practice of the primitive Church and the rules of its earliest codes, shall we be wrong in urging that if the judicature of the English Church diverges in this respect so far from that of those centuries to which confessedly she looks for example, and diverges in the direction of arbitrary and uncontrolled individual power, the sooner so serious a blot upon our system is wiped away the better; however venerable the prescription quoted—correctly or no—on behalf of the existing state of things?

The synod of bishops or the single bishop? the plurality of judges or the sole judge?

From the very first moment at which we have any evidence at all, we can see how synods of bishops, each the freely chosen representative of his people, formed the natural and obvious method of expressing the mind of the Church on those wider issues which concerned more than a single diocese. When Victor of Rome disturbed the Church over the Easter question (c. 196 A.D.), such synods were held in Palestine, at Rome, in Pontus, in Gaul, in Osrohoene. Early in the third century Karthage, Iconium, and Synnada had their councils on the question of heretical baptism. Cyprian, the organiser, but not the founder, of this system of episcopal intercourse, held regularly synods of the African bishops, and six of his letters are written in their name.<sup>1</sup> The presumption that the trial of a bishop demanded no less an assembly is borne out by the allusions in the same (Cyprianic) correspondence. If Cyprian sometimes treats a bishop as *ipso facto* excommunicate like Fortunatianus of Assuræ in Africa and the Spanish bishops Basilides and Martialis, all of whom had fallen in the persecution, or Marcianus of Arles, who had joined Novatian,

<sup>1</sup> Cyprian, *Epp.* lvii., lxi., lxiv., lxvii., lxx., lxxii.; for the early synods see Eus. *H. E.* v. 23, Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxi. § 4, lxxv. § 7. Cf. Tertullian *De jejuniis*, § 13: 'Aguntur præterea per Gracías illa certis in locis concilia ex universis ecclesiis, per quæ et altiora quæque in commune tractantur, et ipsa representatio totius nominis Christiani magna veneratione celebratur.'

and  
with  
could  
Bish  
cate  
the r  
the s  
fical  
Basil  
the s  
of lap  
by th  
'post  
Gem  
defini  
gress  
case o  
tution  
we ar  
synod  
TH  
conce  
turn  
ence t  
Samos  
openn  
most  
held o  
many  
until  
called  
Bostra  
Samos  
nature  
to whic  
hood,  
princip  
was hin  
profess  
<sup>1</sup> Cyp  
datam.  
<sup>2</sup> Cyp  
porum se  
apparent  
<sup>3</sup> Eus  
ἀνδρα πέν

and had therefore by implication broken off communion with the Church, this is not to claim that he, a single bishop, could try the case of another. Rather, with respect to the Bishop of Arles, he requests Stephen of Rome to communicate with the bishops of Gaul in order that they should take the necessary steps. To the Spanish churches he writes as the spokesman of thirty-six of his colleagues, and it is specifically mentioned that Sabinus had been elected in place of Basilides by the whole flock and the assembled bishops on the spot: from the same Epistle, too, we learn that the case of lapsed bishops as a whole had been adjudicated on already by the bishops of Africa as well as elsewhere. There is also the 'post mortem' excommunication directed by Cyprian against Geminus Victor, Bishop of Furni; but this again is based definitely on the ground that the provisions of his will transgressed a decision of the African episcopate.<sup>1</sup> Finally, the case of Privatus of Lambæse is a type of the normal constitutional action of the African Church. He had been charged, we are told, with many serious crimes, and condemned in a synod of no less than ninety bishops.<sup>2</sup>

The questions brought to trial in the West were those concerning discipline and morals. For doctrinal cases we turn naturally to the East, and from Eusebius' cursory reference to Beryllus of Bostra and the fuller details about Paul of Samosata we gain a singularly attractive impression of the openness and fairness with which, in the third century, even the most novel and startling statements were treated. Beryllus held quasi-Sabellian views of the nature of Christ, and 'very many bishops held inquiries and discussions with the man,'<sup>3</sup> until finally Origen, the great theologian of the East, was called in, with the happy result of convincing the Bishop of Bostra of his errors. To decide the charges against Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, who taught that Christ was 'by nature a common man,' no less than three synods assembled,<sup>4</sup> to which, besides the bishops and clergy of the neighbourhood, many even among distant bishops were invited. Of the principal occupants of Eastern sees, Dionysius of Alexandria was hindered from coming by age and infirmity, and sent a profession of his faith by letter, but Firmilian of Cæsarea

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. *Ep.* i. § 2: 'Contra formam nuper in concilio a sacerdotibus datum.' The other references are *Ep.* lxxv., lxxvii., lxxviii.

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. *Ep.* lix. § 10: 'Ob multa et gravia delicta nonaginta episcoporum sententia condemnatum antecessorum etiam nostrorum.' It was apparently before Cyprian's elevation to the episcopate.

<sup>3</sup> Eus. *H. E.* vi. 33, πλείστων ἐπισκόπων ζητήσεις καὶ διαλόγους πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα πεποιμένων.

<sup>4</sup> Eus. *H. E.* vii. 27-30.

(in Cappadocia), Gregory of Neocæsarea, and the Bishops of Iconium, Tarsus, Jerusalem, Palestinian Cæsarea, and Bostra were present at one or other synod. After the doctrinal issue had been threshed out, no difference of opinion remained as to the heretical nature of the opinions attributed to Paul; but it was doubtful whether the charges were fully brought home to him, and Firmilian, the president, accepting his assurances, and 'believing and hoping that the case could come to a right issue without bringing our religion into contempt' by the deposition of a leading bishop, gave his voice for delay. Two synods passed without resort to extreme measures, and it was only in the third that Malchion, a presbyter and ex-sophist of Antioch, in the course of a public discussion with Paul, was able (by the precaution of having his answers taken down in shorthand) to convict him of heresy. The condemnation of Paul and the election of Domnus in his place followed, and were communicated by a synodal letter to Dionysius of Rome, Maximus of Alexandria, and 'all our fellow-ministers, bishops, priests, and deacons throughout the world, and to the whole Catholic Church under heaven'; and it was the agreement of the bishops in Italy and Rome, presumably expressed in synod, with the council, which the Emperor Aurelian, acting, if not under Christian influence, at any rate with a clear perception of Christian practice, regarded as decisive against Paul's remaining in possession of the 'temporalities' at Antioch.

The witness of the ante-Nicene age, if somewhat meagre in amount and drawn rather from instinctive practice than any written code, is thus coherent and consistent in entirely negating any such conception as that of the trial of the bishop before a single judge. But admittedly the appeal in the present inquiry is substantially to the body of canons accumulated in the councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, which, both as being evidence of a more formal and permanent character than any individual cases, and also as constituting in the main the basis of the canon law of East and West alike, have the best claim to represent the settled mind of the Church. They, too, alone present a completed system of jurisdiction and appeal, and in fact apply the principles which (as we have seen) belong to a much earlier age to the more elaborate territorial organization of the Episcopate.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For a fuller account than can be given here of the growth of the federation of bishoprics, provinces, *διοικήσεις*, and patriarchates, some grasp of which is a necessary preliminary to the study of the canons, we may refer to the *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1888, pp. 295-326.

and t  
for th  
Arian  
tions  
age o  
could  
with,  
time  
could  
requi  
rate a  
T  
lence  
very  
mom  
Nica  
fully  
West  
sent  
thoug  
a wid  
in the  
those  
are th  
fluent

TI  
Nica  
the pr  
it in f  
bisho  
but th  
sion b  
oppos  
the vo  
must l  
this is  
has al  
senten  
regula  
connex  
safegu

<sup>1</sup> Ni  
elected  
right to  
canon 1

and the more imperious necessity both for the protection and for the control of individual bishops which the pressure of the Arian struggle and the complex results of the altered relations of the Church and the world first made prominent in the age of Constantine. Contingencies, before so rare that they could safely be left to the instinct of the moment to deal with, became now comparatively common; while at the same time in the councils which a Church no longer persecuted could freely hold, an attempt could be made to meet new requirements, and gradually, almost unconsciously, to elaborate a systematized judicature.

The councils, whose canons owing to their intrinsic excellence and wide reception have survived, were themselves<sup>1</sup> of very different sizes and characters, and therefore, so far, at the moment of very different authority. Some, like those of Nicæa and Chalcedon, were nominally universal, and in fact fully representative of the East, and to some extent of the West as well. Others, like Sardica and Constantinople, represented one or other half of the Empire. Some, like Ancyra, though small in number of members, were representative of a wide area; while others, like Gangra and Laodicea, were in the first instance purely provincial. But, on the whole, those councils which are most important for our purpose are the most representative and the most immediately influential.

Thus while the canons of the two smaller councils before Nicæa, those of Ancyra and Neocæsarea, have no bearing on the provincial and synodal system, the canons of Nicæa picture it in full working order. The election and consecration of bishops belongs 'if possible to all the bishops in the province'; but three at least must meet, and the rest signify their adhesion by letter. It is added afterwards that if two or three oppose out of obstructiveness the election made by the rest, the vote of the great majority is to stand. The metropolitan must be one of the majority and ratify their decision; and this is the extent of his prerogative.<sup>1</sup> But the provincial synod has also powers of jurisdiction as a court of appeal from the sentence of any individual bishop, and these powers are to be regularly exercised at meetings held twice a year. In this connexion emphasis is laid on the totality of bishops as a safeguard against mistakes on the part of one; and naturally,

<sup>1</sup> Nicæa, canons 4, 6. While the bishop under this system was not elected in the first place by his diocese, the diocese had apparently the right to refuse him after his election and consecration. See Ancyra canon 18; Antioch canons 17, 18.

therefore, no mention at all is here made of the individual metropolitan.<sup>1</sup>

Of a court to which the bishop himself is responsible nothing is here said. Though the fifteenth canon lays down that translations of bishops, as well as of other clergy, from one diocese to another are to be null and void, and the party translated to be restored to his original Church; and the second canon that those who ordain neophytes shall, as guilty of disrespect to the 'great synod' which forbids it, 'endanger their position'; in neither case is the machinery specified by which the penalty is to be enforced. But in further support of the presumption that the trial of a bishop by the metropolitan alone was still foreign to the ideas of the Nicene Church, an *a fortiori* argument may be drawn from the sixth canon. 'Let the ancient customs prevail, those, that is, of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria should have dominion over all these parts, since a similar state of things exists at Rome.' The council is conscious that this unusual power in any one bishop needs ratification; and it is ratified on the two grounds that it is ancient and that it is not absolutely unique. Thus the Bishop of Alexandria possessed a far wider local prerogative than any other Eastern bishop, and what he refrained from doing no ordinary metropolitan could have done. Did then his 'dominion over' Egypt cover the right to try a bishop as sole judge? Among the original adherents of Arius were numbered two bishops, Secundus and Theonas, who, together with several Alexandrian priests, were tried and deposed shortly before the council, not by Alexander of Alexandria alone, but in conjunction with a synod; and just as Cyprian had emphasized the condemnation of Privatus by a vote of ninety bishops, so Alexander in his circular letter to the Churches emphasizes, not the authority of the president, but the number of the bishops, 'nearly one hundred,' who pronounced the sentence and the extent of the area, 'Egypt and the Libyas,' which they represented.<sup>2</sup>

Of primary importance for our inquiry are the canons which chronologically follow next in order. Between the Councils of Nicæa (A.D. 325) and of Antioch (A.D. 341), the Arian controversy had entered on an acuter stage. Trials and depositions were the order of the day. Synod was pitted against synod, and appeal against appeal. Athanasius had been

<sup>1</sup> Canon 5: *ε.γ. κοινή πάντων τῶν ἐπισκόπων: παρὰ πάντων εἶναι δόξωσι: τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ἐπισκόπων.*

<sup>2</sup> Socrates, *H. E.* i. 6.

conde  
Egyp  
Antio  
Rome  
act on  
the en  
sity to  
which  
mitted  
the co  
the pr  
cil wer  
at leas  
althou  
the A  
Arian  
Arian  
canon

We  
a whol  
fortuna  
argume  
thirteen  
depose  
merited  
His G  
the nar  
paraph

But  
touched  
to the s  
elevent  
the stru  
priest a  
to the t

<sup>1</sup> The  
absence o

<sup>2</sup> The  
from the  
σύνδοδος ἐί  
ments, ἐδ  
καὶ τοῦτου  
are more  
before; v  
the holy  
ἀνεπιληπτ  
for hersel



condemned by a synod at Tyre, and acquitted by a synod in Egypt; his successor had been consecrated by bishops at Antioch, while his rights were being affirmed by bishops at Rome; his enemies had urged the emperor to recognize and act on the synodical deposition, and he suddenly appealed to the emperor in person against them. It was a pressing necessity to formulate a code of rules on jurisdictions and appeals, which, by giving further expression to principles already admitted, might gain general acceptance, and help to clear up the confusion which prevailed.<sup>1</sup> And it is a striking proof of the prudence and success with which this Antiochene council went to work, that although it consisted, if not of Arians, at least of allies of Arians and opponents of Athanasius, and although some of its provisions were obviously aimed against the Alexandrian bishop, yet as soon as the stress of the Arian struggle was forgotten, the regulations of the quasi-Arian council obtained an unquestioned footing in the Catholic canon law.

We rest our case so confidently on these canons taken as a whole that we can afford to admit frankly that a most unfortunate use of one at least of them was made in the recent arguments, when the Bishop of Lincoln's counsel quoted the thirteenth canon as showing that intruding bishops 'are to be deposed by a sacred synod,' and exposed himself to the merited rebuff of a corrected translation by the Archbishop. His Grace pointed out unanswerably that 'holy synod' is the name by which the council regularly denotes itself, and paraphrased the Greek '*ipso facto* excommunicate.'<sup>2</sup>

But the main body of Antiochene evidence remains untouched. Of the two groups of canons, those from the second to the sixth—and with these would fall in one aspect of the eleventh and twelfth—contain provisions bearing directly on the struggles of the time, the setting up of altar against altar, priest against bishop, bishop against synod; while the ninth to the twenty-fifth and last define the functions of provincial

<sup>1</sup> The greater the turmoil of these years, the more remarkable the absence of instances of any metropolitan claiming to sit as sole judge.

<sup>2</sup> The Greek is καθηρημένον ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου, 'deposed from the very moment by the holy synod.' Cf. in canon 1, τοῦτον ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη ἀλλότριον ἐκρίνε; and Canons 10, 14, of novel enactments, εἶδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ. The concluding words of the last canon, καὶ τοιούτους διορθώσεως τυγχάνειν, τὸ πρέπον δοκιμαζούσης τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου, are more difficult, especially as the provincial synod is mentioned just before; we should still wish to take them of the synod then sitting, 'for the holy synod approves seemliness,' comparing Nicæa 9, τὸ γὰρ ἀνεπιληπτον ἐκδικεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, 'for the Catholic Church vindicates for herself blamelessness.'

synods and metropolitans, and in these the special necessities of the moment, though doubtless equally present to the thoughts of the council, are less prominently expressed. We will commence with the latter, as at once simpler and more permanent.

The ninth canon treats of bishops and metropolitans. While each bishop has independent authority in diocesan matters, to the metropolitan belongs the general duty of 'accepting the care for the whole province,'<sup>1</sup> on the ground of the civil position of the metropolis as the centre of all business transactions; consequently (*ὅθεν*) the metropolitan has 'precedence in honour,' and the other bishops, 'according to the canon of our fathers in force from old times,' are to do nothing 'extraordinary' or 'superfluous,' nothing beyond diocesan duties, without him. But does this 'care for the whole province' include any powers, and especially any powers of jurisdiction over individual bishops, apart from the action of the comprovincials? Certainly not; for the same canon concludes 'nor is the metropolitan to act without the consent of the rest,'<sup>2</sup> and a similar relation is expressed in other canons—e.g. 'not without the consent and letters of the provincial bishops, and particularly of the metropolitan'; 'by letters of the metropolitan and the bishops with him'; 'not without a synod and the presence of him of the metropolis of the province.'<sup>3</sup> Or the same idea is expressed by the technical phrase, 'the complete synod,'<sup>4</sup> defined in canon 18 as that 'where he also of the metropolis is present.' If the metropolitan is ever mentioned alone it is in connexion with duties which fall necessarily on the president or executive officer of an assembly. Thus he is required to convoke the meetings of bishops for episcopal elections as well as the regular synods twice a year; and, when the provincial bishops sitting as a

<sup>1</sup> Canon 9, τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστῶτα ἐπίσκοπον καὶ τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχασθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας.

<sup>2</sup> περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν διὰ τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ αὐτὸν ἀνέν τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης. The Archbishop in discussing the parallel phrase in the apostolic canons (*v. infra*) as quoted from Johnson, 'Nor let him [that is, the chief bishop] do anything [extraordinary] without the consent of all,' argues that 'if the chief bishop has a court and jurisdiction, that which he does regularly within this, in the exercise of that jurisdiction, is not extraordinary.' But (1) we desiderate some *positive* evidence, that the metropolitan had such 'a court and jurisdiction' at all; and (2) we object to Johnson's interpolation of the word 'extraordinary,' and to the sense which the Archbishop makes it to bear: *περιττὸν*, *περαιτέρω*, mean surely 'provincial' as opposed to 'diocesan' business.

<sup>3</sup> Canons 11, 13, 19.

<sup>4</sup> τελεία σύνοδος, Canons 16, 17, 18.

court  
call  
clude  
no p  
of th  
make  
its d  
quene  
A  
appea  
sees.  
of tho  
to wh  
means  
of at  
one of  
imper  
acts w  
jurisdi  
of indi  
nicated  
'comm  
versely  
punish  
persona  
Nor is  
for. S  
condem  
them, th  
provinc  
the met  
ing prov  
come to  
nizing a  
the disse  
of comp  
case bef  
varies w  
judges w  
But a  
antiquity  
province,  
should b

<sup>1</sup> Canon

<sup>2</sup> Canon

court to try one of their number are divided in opinion, he calls in neighbouring bishops as additional judges.<sup>1</sup> We conclude that the canons of Antioch recognize in the metropolitan no powers or prerogatives save in connexion with the synod of the province. His presence at the synod is necessary to make its meeting legitimate, his consent apparently to make its decisions valid. His increasing importance is a consequence of the increasing importance of synodical action.

As at Nicæa, the synod of the province meets to consider appeals from episcopal decisions, as well as to appoint to vacant sees. As a natural consequence it also adjudicates on the cases of those bishops who either refuse, or are refused by, the dioceses to which they are consecrated.<sup>2</sup> But these functions by no means exhaust the activity of the provincial synod as conceived of at Antioch. Its previous consent must be obtained before one of its own bishops can leave his diocese to travel to the imperial court, or before a foreign bishop can perform episcopal acts within its boundaries.<sup>3</sup> And it also possesses exactly that jurisdiction of which we are in search, as a court for the trial of individual bishops. A bishop who receives the excommunicated clergy of another diocese is to be punished by the 'common' (that is apparently the provincial) synod. Conversely, if he ordains clergy in another diocese, he is to be punished by 'the synod.' If he misuses diocesan funds for personal ends he is responsible to 'the synod of the province.'<sup>4</sup> Nor is the machinery of sentence and appeal left unprovided for. Should all the bishops of the province be unanimous in condemning the bishop who is 'accused on any charges' before them, the sentence stands; there is no appeal. Should the provincial bishops, on the other hand, be divided in opinion, the metropolitan is to call in 'some others from the neighbouring province,' in order that the two bodies in conjunction may come to a final decision.<sup>5</sup> So far is the council from recognizing anything like the principle of the single judge, that even the dissent in the first instance of one out of the whole body of comprovincials is sufficient ground for a rehearing of the case before a still larger court. The validity of the sentence varies with the number rather than with the importance of the judges who pronounce it.

But a provincial synod was not the only synod known to antiquity. Just as in it were decided questions relative to the province, so was it natural that matters of still wider interest should be settled at larger synods; with this difference, how-

<sup>1</sup> Canons 14, 19, 20.<sup>2</sup> Canons 20, 19 (cf. 23, 16), 17, 18.<sup>3</sup> Canons 11, 13.<sup>4</sup> Canons 3, 22, 25.<sup>5</sup> Canons 13, 14

ever, that while the area, presidency and jurisdiction of the smaller body were by this time fixed by canon and custom, the others, being drawn as yet from no definite areas, were held under very varying conditions.<sup>1</sup> While the case of a provincial bishop would come in the ordinary course of things before the provincial synod, the trial of a metropolitan was also a contingency to be taken into account; in fact the instances which at the moment were uppermost in all minds, were those of the metropolitans Eustathius of Antioch, Marcellus of Ancyra, and still more Athanasius of Alexandria. The depositions of these bishops had been effected, not of course at the synods of their own suffragans, but at synods of a larger but less definite character; and it was just this want of fixity in their constitutions which might add a canonical to the doctrinal ground for contesting the validity of the sentences. So it was incumbent on the Council of Antioch to lay down some rules which, if not attaining so high a degree of precision as those for provincial synods, should outline the conditions under which this vaguer jurisdiction should be exercised, and the direction in which, if at all, it could be legitimately contested.

In the first place, then, the fourth canon lays down the principle that any sentence of deposition of a bishop by a synod<sup>2</sup> is to stand until overruled, and if the deposed bishop sets the sentence at naught and continues to exercise his office, he forfeits thereby any claim to appear before, or to be restored by, a second synod. The same penalty is imposed by the twelfth canon on a bishop who appeals against a synodical deposition to the Emperor, when he ought 'to appeal to a larger synod and to bring his pleas before a greater number of bishops.'<sup>3</sup> In these canons, too, the allusion is therefore ex-

<sup>1</sup> This was of course less the case later; see below. Dr. Hatch's objection, drawn from the existence of councils of this sort (like that of Ancyra), against the prevalence of the provincial system before Nicæa (*Church Institutions*, p. 121), is surely met by the consideration here suggested.

<sup>2</sup> The 'synod' of the fourth and twelfth canons must not be limited to the provincial synods, of which no special mention is made till a later canon; indeed, since appeals from provincial synods are dealt with differently (Canons 14, 15), it seems probable that the reference of these earlier canons is primarily to the larger and indefinite synods.

<sup>3</sup> Canon 12. *διὸν ἐπὶ μέγιστα ἐπισκόπων σύνοδον τρέπεσθαι καὶ ἂν νομίξει δίκαια ἔχειν προσαναφέρειν πλείοσιν ἐπισκόποις.* Athanasius, we remember, while appealing from the sentence of the Council of Tyre, had in the interim treated his deposition as null; and had also sought a personal interview with the Emperor in order to counteract the influence of the Arian Court bishops. The references to his case can hardly be considered doubtful.

clusi  
cogni  
first i  
synod  
the nu  
Bu  
Archb  
'Or  
gives a  
of trial.  
cause o  
limiting  
commen

We

'If  
consent  
him of  
commun  
from the  
ears of c  
But if n  
Emperor  
bishop o  
be suppl

Now th  
more th  
through  
transfer  
ment of  
cause un  
ultimate  
episcopa  
in the ne  
really ma  
trial of b

The s  
to do wit  
canon of  
deal with  
sion of t  
duties in  
push on t  
service fo

<sup>1</sup> Sardic  
ad comitatu

clusively to synods of some sort or another as the only recognized procedure for trying a bishop, whether in courts of first instance or of appeal; and again, too, the right of one synod to overrule the decision of another earlier one rests on the number of bishops who compose it.

But from a canon closely connected with the twelfth, Archbishop Benson deduces a directly opposite conclusion:

‘On the contrary, the eleventh canon (which was not quoted) gives a distinct indication, at least in certain cases, of another mode of trial. It provides for a bishop, if necessity arose, transferring his cause directly to the judgment of the Crown (the Emperor)—not limiting the kind of cause to civil causes—by permission and with commendatory letters from his metropolitan or comprovincials.’

We will place before our readers a translation of the canon:

‘If any bishop or presbyter, or any of the clergy at all, without the consent and letters of the bishops in the province, and especially of him of the metropolis, start off to go to the Emperor, he is to be excommunicated and excluded not only from communion but also from the rank which he happens to hold, as daring to trouble the ears of our most pious Emperor, contrary to the law of the Church. But if necessary business should summon him to start off to the Emperor, he must do so with the consideration and consent of the bishop of the metropolis of the province or of the comprovincials, and be supplied for his journey with letters from them.’

Now there is not a word in all this which applies to bishops more than to the rest of the clergy; the reference is indefinite throughout. So far, therefore, as a bishop is empowered to transfer his cause unheard by the synod ‘directly to the judgment of the Crown,’ so far also is a presbyter to transfer his cause unheard by the bishop. For it is no provision for an ultimate hearing by the Emperor; an appeal to him from an episcopal or synodical decision is forbidden in so many words in the next canon. Are we then to believe that this canon really makes the Emperor a court of first instance for the trial of bishops and presbyters?

The simple truth is that the canon has nothing exclusively to do with jurisdiction at all. It is an endeavour, like another canon of the contemporary Western Council of Sardica, to deal with the disastrous practice, consequent on the conversion of the Empire, of bishops and clergy abandoning their duties in order to plunge into the intrigues of the Court, and to push on the spot their requests for posts in the imperial civil service for their friends.<sup>1</sup> Probably, too, among other motives

<sup>1</sup> Sardica, Canon 7 or 8: ‘Plures enim episcoporum non intermittunt ad comitatum venientes . . . ita ut unus homo in comitatu plurimas ac-

for these Court visits might sometimes be anxiety to forestall a synodical trial and condemnation. If so, this would beyond doubt have been a move which the council would have been particularly anxious to checkmate, by their regulation that the business must be 'necessary,' and the consent of the provincial synod obtained. The very last excuse, we may be sure, which a bishop's colleagues would pronounce 'necessary,' would be a desire on his part to escape their jurisdiction. Archbishop Benson's interpretation surely contradicts not only the most obvious sense of the canon itself but every principle on which the whole structure of the Antiochene system is built. The presbyter is tried in the first instance by his bishop, but he can appeal from his diocesan to the provincial synod. The bishop is tried by a body of his fellow-bishops, and if difference of opinion on their part warrants a second hearing, the court is a larger body of bishops still. The more the judges, the safer the sentence, is the motto of the council.

Closely related in this question to the canons of Antioch are the canons called apostolic, on which it would seem that the Bishop of Lincoln's counsel laid undue stress; for quite apart from their non-reception in the Western Church, a sufficiently early date cannot be attributed to them to make their evidence of any independent importance. The 27th (otherwise 33rd or 35th) canon covers exactly the same ground as the 9th of Antioch, and it is decidedly more probable that the apostolic canon is the copy than the original. At or soon after the middle of the fourth century there flourished at Antioch a writer, or school of writers, to whom we owe at any rate the final shape of some of the most prominent literary forgeries (to use a modern term) of early Christian times. The interpolated Ignatian letters, the pseudo-apostolic constitutions and canons (however much of earlier material they may incorporate), all date from the same epoch and belong to the same cycle, and, interesting as is the problem of working out the aims and tendencies of these compilations, it scarcely falls within the scope of our immediate purpose.

More important is the evidence, nearly contemporary with that of the Antiochene Council for the East, supplied for the West by the canons of Sardica (A.D. 343), which acquired so great an authority that at least in Italy they were in the early years of the fifth century reckoned as Nicene. We must not

*diversas et nihil ad utilitatem proficientes ecclesiarum preces adportet . . . sed sæculares dignitates et administrationes provideat quibusdam.*<sup>1</sup>

indee  
tion a  
which  
Africa  
satisfi  
being  
range  
in the  
the Sa  
is som  
of the  
and ye  
jealous  
metho  
their c  
ing of  
belong  
excom  
tives o  
the ha  
the as  
mitted  
novel o  
to Juli  
of opin  
stands;  
next p  
prefers  
ing hir  
Even in  
the ult  
enforce  
East, is  
neighb  
not eve  
a furth  
metrop  
Antioch

Fort  
or rath

<sup>1</sup> Sarc  
16), 15 (o  
<sup>2</sup> Sarc  
<sup>3</sup> The  
Laodiceæ



indeed expect to meet in the West with a system of jurisdiction and appeal so nicely graduated and finished as that to which the Eastern Church was feeling her way; for (putting Africa aside) Western Christianity was of younger growth, and satisfied with a less elaborate framework, and the defect was being supplemented rather by the informal authority—in range if not in character utterly alien from anything known in the East—of the see of Rome. We are prepared to find in the Sardican canons that the organization even of the province is somewhat inchoate, while at the other end the interference of the Roman bishop in appeals is recognized and sanctioned; and yet both these features stand side by side with the same jealousy of despotic, the same reliance on constitutional, methods as we saw prevail in the East. Clergy deposed by their own bishop have a right to a second trial before a meeting of bishops. Bishops who, either by ordaining clergy belonging to another diocese or conversely by receiving clergy excommunicated in another diocese, trench on the prerogatives of a fellow-bishop, are subject to admonition or trial at the hands of their brethren.<sup>1</sup> A bishop may be deposed by the assembled bishops of the neighbourhood, but he is permitted to appeal—apparently the enactment is treated as a novel one—in honour of the memory of the Apostle Peter<sup>2</sup> to Julius, the then Bishop of Rome. If the Roman bishop is of opinion that the appeal is causeless, the first decision stands; if otherwise, he may either write to the bishops of the next province and authorize them to decide the case, or, if he prefers, he may send presbyters with full powers of representing him to sit as judges in conjunction with the bishops.<sup>3</sup> Even in face of the remarkable privilege accorded to Rome, the ultimate principles for which we are contending are clearly enforced. The court of first instance in the West, as in the East, is composed of the assembled bishops of the province or neighbourhood; the appeal is heard, not before one judge, not even before the Bishop of Rome or his legates, but before a further body of judges. A monarchical judicature of the metropolis is as far from recognition at Sardica as at Antioch.

Forty years later the second canon of the Œcumenical, or rather Eastern, Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sardica canon 14 (or 17): cf. Nicæa 5, Antioch 20. Sardica 13 (or 16), 15 (or 19): cf. Antioch 22, 23, 26.

<sup>2</sup> Sardica canons, 3, 5 (or 7).

<sup>3</sup> The canons of the small intermediate Councils of Gangra and Laodicea throw no fresh light on the subject.

renews what it calls the Nicene rule, that 'the synod of the province shall manage the affairs of the province.' But, besides the federation of dioceses into a province, the ecclesiastical organization of the East had now achieved a further step, and provinces were federated into (in the technical language of the day) a 'diocesis.' Of these 'dioceses' there were, in the sphere for which the council might presume to legislate, five—Egypt, the 'East,' Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. The canon extends the provincial rule, and provides that 'the bishops' of each 'diocesis' shall govern that 'diocesis' only.<sup>1</sup>

The canon known as the sixth of the same council was urged on behalf of the Bishop of Lincoln, and the Archbishop's judgment lays great and natural stress on its non-reception in early and specially Western collections. It would, in fact, seem to have been a canon of the subsequent synod of A.D. 383. But for our momentary purpose of illustrating the history of ecclesiastical judicature by official conciliar decisions, it is as strictly valid in its degree as the canons of any other, even an œcumenical, council. And on internal grounds it is altogether too remarkable to be passed over. It deals with accusations against orthodox bishops, and its provisions mark the common sense and entire absence of sacerdotalism (in its worse meaning) of the Eastern Church in the fourth century. A clear line of demarcation is drawn between two kinds of cases. If the charge is personal, if it is brought against the bishop in his individual capacity, then neither the character nor the religious belief of the plaintiff is in point, for 'the conscience of a bishop ought to be free, and anyone who claims to have been wronged, of whatever religion he be, ought to obtain his rights.' But if the charge be an ecclesiastical one, then the *personnel* of the accusers must be matter of inquiry; for heretics, schismatics, or churchmen under excommunication or accusation, are not fit persons to bring charges on ecclesiastical matters against orthodox bishops—a rule which might aptly be put in force in some latter-day trials. But if the *locus standi* of the prosecutor is unexceptional, then the case is to be heard before

<sup>1</sup> If, in the case of Egypt, it is not 'the bishops' of Egypt, but 'the bishop' of Alexandria, this is taken from the sixth canon of Nicæa, just as 'the privileges of the Nicene canons' are similarly reserved to Antioch in the 'diocesis of the East.' We have already shown that the canon of Nicæa is apparently not to be interpreted as according, even in the exceptional case of the Alexandrian bishop, the right of sitting as sole judge over his suffragans.

'all the  
compro  
the bish  
of the b  
one, in  
ears of  
œcumen  
'dioces  
for wan  
the Chu

The  
legislat  
one of  
the de  
and ef  
perhap  
Consta  
rather  
it was t  
now it  
not onl  
synod;  
for each  
of app  
vided is  
invitati  
provinc  
next in  
hand, t  
definite  
are in  
prosecu  
the prov  
structed  
body lar  
court of

Between  
Ephesus  
elapse;  
stating t  
seventy  
Beyond

<sup>1</sup> The  
the definit  
Constantin

'all the bishops of the province. And if it should happen that the comprovincials are unequal to deciding on the charges brought against the bishop, then they (the accusers) must appear before a greater synod of the bishops of that 'diœcesis' summoned *ad hoc*. . . . But if anyone, in despite of the above decrees, shall venture either to annoy the ears of the Emperor or the courts of secular judges, or to disturb an œcumenical synod, in contempt of the whole body of bishops of the 'diœcesis,' he is absolutely debarred from appearing as prosecutor, for wantonly despising the canons and violating the good order of the Church.'

The points of comparison and contrast with the Antiochene legislation are both noticeable. The difference is primarily one of tone: while the canons of Antioch seem prompted by the desire to render the procedure of episcopal trials easy and effective, in the interim ease and effectiveness were perhaps found to be not the only requisites, for the canon of Constantinople obviously aims at discouraging unreasonable rather than at encouraging reasonable prosecutions. Before it was the bishop who was forbidden to apply to the Emperor, now it is the accuser, who is equally debarred from recourse, not only to the secular courts, but even to an œcumenical synod; such synods, since they could not be reckoned on for each occasion, lay necessarily outside the regular system of appeals provided by the canon. The re-hearing provided is no longer before the indefinite court formed by the invitation from the metropolitan to bishops of the nearest province, but before the regular court of the 'greater synod'<sup>1</sup> next in gradation to the provincial synod. On the other hand, the conditions of appeal, precise at Antioch, are indefinite here, though it is to be noted that in both cases they are in the hands rather of the original judges than of the prosecutor or defendant. In both councils too the first court, the provincial synod, is identical, and the further court is constructed in both on the principle of a re-hearing before a body larger in numbers and so weightier in authority. The court of the sole judge is wholly absent still.

Between the Council of Constantinople and those of Ephesus and Chalcedon fifty and seventy years respectively elapse; and Archbishop Benson is in a measure justified in stating that 'the ancient canons themselves within even the seventy years . . . show the tendency towards centralization.' Beyond question the movement of the time was enhancing

<sup>1</sup> The 'great synod' of Antioch (canon 12) is scarcely to be taken in the definite sense of the 'greater synod of the diœcesis' of this canon of Constantinople.

the importance of the metropolitan, and depreciating the importance of the provincial bishops and the provincial synod. To the œcumenical Council of Ephesus only the metropolitans and a few of the provincial bishops were summoned. At Chalcedon we learn that the two annual provincial synods ordered by the canons of Nicæa and Antioch had ceased largely though not universally to be held; and it is possible that the general disuse of synodical action thus implied had for one of its practical results the (certainly uncanonical) usurpation by the metropolitan of sole judicial as well as executive authority. The Archbishop reminds us that 'we find still earlier [than Chalcedon], among a small number of bishops who assembled in a counter-synod at Ephesus in A.D. 441 [*lege* A.D. 431], some bishops who "many years ago had been deposed for grave causes by their own metropolitans."' <sup>1</sup> Yet we are not sure if even these words will quite securely bear the weight of the construction put on them. A council composed so largely of metropolitans might unconsciously exaggerate the part of the metropolitan. The sentence of deposition may be pronounced, as in the case of Bishop Colenso, by the metropolitan alone, and the deposition therefore in current language be attributed to him, even when the trial has really taken place before the full court of provincial bishops. The twenty-fifth canon of Chalcedon presents a close parallel when (deviating from the language used at Nicæa and Antioch) it speaks of metropolitans as charged with the ordination of bishops; and yet it is not to be supposed that the metropolitan had really ousted his comprovincials from all share in the election, to say nothing of the consecration, of nominees to vacant dioceses.

But in any case the evidence so far considered is only the evidence of facts, disclosing a natural and to some extent inevitable tendency towards centralization. It has still to be asked how far this tendency was ratified by the conscious approval of the Church as expressed in her councils.

Perhaps the first canon of Ephesus may seem to support the Archbishop's contention. Any metropolitan who 'apo-statizing from the holy and œcumenical synod has joined or shall join the synod of the apostasy . . . has no power to take any action whatever against his suffragans.' But that this, too, should be interpreted of the influence and position of the metropolitan as the representative of the combined action of himself and the comprovincials, is indicated by the conclud-

<sup>1</sup> '*Epist. Synod. Conc. Eph. ad Cælestinum*, Labbe, Paris, vol. iii. p. 364.'

ing s  
by th  
episc  
vince  
doctr  
in the  
exclu  
colle  
C  
retain  
at ele  
emph  
again  
of the  
stored  
a cleri  
betwe  
when  
attrib  
counc  
canon  
jurisdi  
be co  
of all-  
it may  
of thes  
Th  
which  
highes  
the ex  
nople.  
the ex  
politan  
fallen v  
and do  
his syn  
the cou  
be fairl  
tralizat  
metrop

<sup>1</sup> Cha  
<sup>2</sup> The  
the chief  
tioch; in  
Heraclea

ing stipulation that such metropolitan, already excommunicated by the synod then sitting, may further be deposed from the episcopate by the action of those of the bishops of the province and neighbouring metropolitans who hold orthodox doctrine. If the provincial bishops take part as joint judges in the case of the metropolitan himself, can they have been excluded from the same function in the cases of their colleagues?

Certainly the canons of Chalcedon tend rather towards retaining and restoring the prerogatives of the synod than at elevating the metropolitan at its expense. One canon emphasizes, 'according to the canons of the holy fathers' and against contemporary laxity, the rule of the yearly meetings of the provincial synod; others point to the synods thus restored as the proper tribunals for adjudicating suits between a cleric and a bishop, or disputes about diocesan boundaries between one bishop and another.<sup>1</sup> It is inconceivable that when the judicial decision of comparatively trifling causes is attributed to the synod and not to the metropolitan, the council contemplated with approval the violation of 'the canons of the fathers' by the metropolitan's exercise of sole jurisdiction in the most serious cause in which a bishop could be concerned. If this particular usurpation—the grossest of all—had come into fashion (which is more than doubtful), it may safely be argued that it is restrained by the principle of these canons of Chalcedon.

There is, indeed, another provision of this council on which the Archbishop relies. 'As early as A.D. 451 the highest trials between bishops are to be taken before either the exarch of the diocesis or the Archbishop of Constantinople.'<sup>2</sup> But since these 'highest' trials are, according to the express language of the canon, those in which a metropolitan is the defendant, they would not in any case have fallen within the competency of the provincial synod alone, and do not touch the issue as between the metropolitan and his synod in the slightest degree; we have seen what ground the council took up on that point. All that the canon can be fairly quoted as illustrating is the tendency towards centralization, which the council set itself against in the case of metropolitans, but in this case tacitly confirms. By analogy,

<sup>1</sup> Chalcedon, canons 19, 9, 17.

<sup>2</sup> The reference is to Chalcedon Canons 9, 17. The 'exarch' was the chief bishop of a 'diocesis'; in Egypt, Alexandria; in the East, Antioch; in Pontus, Cappadocian Cæsarea; in Asia, Ephesus; in Thrace, Heraclea.

as suits against a bishop fell to the provincial synod, so suits against a metropolitan should have fallen to the synod of the 'diocesis,' or exarchate; and this was no doubt the intention of the so-called sixth canon of Constantinople. Synods of this sort as there provided had not been unknown in practice. To the synod of Aquileia the bishops from the 'diocesis' of Italy were summoned by the emperors, and Ambrose, the Bishop or Exarch of Milan, its capital, presided. The acts of the Ephesine Council speak of 'the synod which met in Alexandria of the Egyptian diocesis'; similarly 'the holy synod of the Oriental diocesis.'<sup>1</sup> But such synods must have been unwieldy to the last degree, and practical convenience outweighed the preference otherwise clearly evinced at Chalcedon for older and more constitutional methods.

However, the synod of the exarchate was really giving way not so much in favour of the exarch as of the alternative court of appeal, 'the throne of imperial Constantinople.'<sup>2</sup> The aggrandizement of New Rome is one of the decisive characteristics of this later period. With the influence arising out of its relation with the Court combined the widespread jealousy felt in the East for both Rome and Alexandria, till the new capital attained by consent rank and privileges to equal those of any other see, and in a sphere which ever since the episcopate of St. Chrysostom, half a century before, had included the whole East except such districts as owned the sway of Alexandria or Antioch. The twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon lays down the general principle of rivalry with Rome very definitely, and sanctions in detail the right to ordain metropolitans (but metropolitans only) in the exarchates of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace; an encroachment, no doubt, but only to a certain extent affecting the provincial bishops, to whom the election is still reserved, 'the votes being unanimous according to the custom, and referred to the Bishop of Constantinople.' In other words, the Patriarch has the same sort of privilege in the appointment of a metropolitan as belonged to the metropolitan in the appointment of an ordinary bishop.

If this is the utmost extent to which Patriarchal interference in provincial matters is carried by a council, all whose

<sup>1</sup> See the note of Justellus on Constantinople Canon 6.

<sup>2</sup> If Archbishop Benson paraphrases these words with 'Archbishop of Constantinople,' he is quite justified by the usage of that time. But then it must not be forgotten that the title 'Archbishop' meant something much more venerable than it does to us, being almost synonymous with Patriarch; no ordinary metropolitan would have been so denominated.

symp  
Patria  
conje  
counc  
very  
Ephes  
Cypri  
tions  
ment,  
the Cl  
princi  
custom  
pleade  
in the  
and ne  
metrop  
If it is  
take a  
as the  
were 't  
holy ch  
to the  
the righ  
notewo  
manner  
tianity.  
anything  
canon l  
pride of  
sciously  
chased f  
the Libe  
More  
Christia  
systems  
lift what  
deal with  
And it is  
by and r  
peers, th  
Yet i  
judgmen  
have not  
any critic



sympathies and prejudices were enlisted on behalf of the Patriarch whose claims they were asked to ratify, it is easy to conjecture that where the contrary was the case, and the council inimical, provincial independence was guaranteed by very stringent enactments. For instance, the Council of Ephesus had quarrelled with John of Antioch, and the Cypriot appeal against this prelate's claim to perform ordinations in the island was favourably entertained. The 'judgment,' known as the eighth canon, assumes that 'the laws of the Church and the canons of the holy fathers' establish the principle of the self-sufficiency of the province. 'Ancient custom' might justify an exception, though this could not be pleaded—so at least the Cypriots had assured the Council—in the case of Cyprus: but such a custom must be 'original' and not a modern usurpation. Nor is a despotism of the metropolitan substituted for the despotism of the patriarch. If it is enacted that 'each metropolitan has permission to take a copy of the proceedings for his own security,' this is as the representative of the province; for the appellants here were 'the Cypriot bishops,' and it is 'the presidents of the holy churches in Cyprus' (in the plural) to whom 'according to the canons of the holy fathers and the ancient custom' the right of ordinations is asserted to belong. What is more noteworthy still, the whole decision is based in the clearest manner on 'liberty' (*ἐλευθερία*) as a first principle of Christianity. The innovation 'strikes at the liberty of all.' It, and anything like it, is null and void, not only as violating the canon law, but 'lest under cloak of sacerdotal action the pride of secular dominion be privily brought in, and unconsciously we lose little by little that liberty which was purchased for us with His own blood by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Liberator of all men.'

More pregnant words were never uttered by a council of Christian bishops. They strike the true keynote for all systems of ecclesiastical organization and jurisdiction. They lift what may seem petty squabbles into a loftier region, and deal with them in the light of an elementary Christian truth. And it is because we believe that they justify the claim made by and refused to the Bishop of Lincoln of a trial before his peers, that we feel and speak strongly on his behalf.

Yet it has been very far from our desire to approach the judgment of the Primate in a hostile spirit. We trust that we have not in the course of this argument been betrayed into any criticism inconsistent in the least degree with the deep

<sup>1</sup> ἀρχαίον : ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς.

respect which is due to his person and his office. We should not wish to forget that it was the place of the Bishop's counsel rather than of the Archbishop to present, as convincingly as it should have been presented, the case for the primitive jurisdiction of the synod; and that a judge is not to be blamed for leaning to the side of the competency of his court until it is disproved to him. We know that when the office assumed is difficult and delicate, it may be the highest course not to shirk responsibility. We appreciate to the full the motive which must animate a Primate situated as Archbishop Benson is situated, and which would weigh with him in exact proportion to his sense of duty and of mission—the hope that by his means some quiet might be restored to a distracted Church. And it will be the fervent wish of every churchman that such may indeed be the issue of the event.

But to us it has seemed that history and reason, Church principle and Church practice, are too deeply involved in the Archbishop's claim for silence to be kept. We are unable to see with him that in the ancient canon law 'there appears all through a jurisdiction vesting in, and exercised by, the metropolitan, sometimes *with*, sometimes only *in*, a synod, and sometimes separately.' We seem rather to see that one form of jurisdiction, and one only, comes to the light in the first four centuries, and that the canons of the later councils rather rebuke than ratify departures from the earlier system; that least of all in questions of trial of a bishop was the court of the metropolitan a recognized alternative to the court of the province. We cannot believe that a constitutional and an absolute jurisdiction were contemporaneous growths. It is true, indeed, that as we pass our glance along the centuries of Christian history a time does come when these two jurisdictions are traceable side by side. But the one is of later creation, and a supplanter of the earlier. It is individual, arbitrary, despotic. The other has an illustrious pedigree and an ancient history. It is deep-rooted in primitive times; it is sanctioned by primitive councils; it is based on primitive principles.

- A  
1. *Ea*  
(  
2. *Th*  
N  
M  
1

It is o  
to hap  
trated  
on Edu  
number  
sible w  
legislat  
of the  
fication  
Act of  
might p

These  
these co  
have bee  
portion  
elicited  
have bee  
Commis  
presided  
influentia  
be taken  
accept w  
favour of  
and the c  
into Acts  
large one,  
notorious  
the Comm  
seemed ve  
enable the  
their task  
was the in  
posed alter  
which the  
be postpon

## ART. VIII.—THE NEW EDUCATION CODE.

1. *Education Department. Code of Regulations with Schedules.* (London, 1889.)
2. *The New Code. Its Authorship and Tendency.* By JOSEPH NUNN, Rural Dean, Rector of St. Thomas Ardwick, Member of the Manchester School Board. (Manchester, 1889.)

It is often said that in political matters nothing is so certain to happen as the unexpected. This has been strikingly illustrated in the fortunes of the Report of the Royal Commission on Education. When we called attention to it in the October number of this *Review* last year only two courses seemed possible with respect to it. The Ministry might consider early legislation desirable, and taking the general recommendations of the Commission as their basis might with certain modifications reconstruct our elementary system of education by Act of Parliament and modifications of the Code. Or they might postpone the subject for a year.

There was a good deal to be said in favour of either of these courses. To reconstruct our educational system would have been very popular with a considerable and influential portion of the supporters of the Ministry, and would have elicited an amount of enthusiasm in their favour, which would have been of priceless value at the next election; and as the Commission was appointed by the present Government and presided over, and its Report apparently fully approved, by an influential member of the Cabinet, it seemed as though it might be taken for granted that the Ministry would substantially accept what the Commission proposed. On the other hand, in favour of delay, there was the fact of obstruction in Parliament, and the consequent difficulty experienced in converting Bills into Acts; and, moreover, the question to be dealt with was a large one, demanding great knowledge of details, which it was notorious that neither the President nor the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education possessed. Therefore it seemed very possible that they might require another year to enable them so to master the whole question as to execute their task satisfactorily; and beyond these considerations there was the increased charge upon the Exchequer, which the proposed alterations of the system would render necessary, and which the head of that department might fairly say must be postponed until next year, as the urgent demands for a

large addition to the fleet would more than swallow up all the funds that he could conveniently raise. With the proved need for extensive changes in our educational system, alike advocated by the majority and minority of the Commission in their Reports, there seemed to be no third course open.

Unhappily one was found. The permanent officials of the Education Department seem to have persuaded their official chiefs that they need take no great trouble about the matter, for that nothing was easier than to make alterations in the Code that would satisfy all the legitimate proposals of the majority of the Commission and the friends of voluntary schools without trenching further upon the national Exchequer, and without any necessity for passing a Bill through Parliament. To secure a favourable reception for the proposed plan a rumour was diligently circulated, from whence proceeding we cannot tell, that a new Code would soon be issued which was most favourable to the voluntary schools, and which could only be disliked by the advocates for School Boards. At length the Code appeared; those responsible for it to Parliament spoke in enthusiastic terms in its favour; many teachers praised it, as some matters for which their Union had long contended were conceded; whilst from school managers and others who had practical knowledge of the subject, and who were not wedded to undenominational religious teaching, there was a unanimous chorus of loud and deep denunciation.

The first point that struck everyone was the almost complete ignoring of the recommendations of the Commission; some of the proposals to which both the majority and the minority had assented in their Reports were found in the Code, but substantially what the Commission advised was utterly disregarded, and their labours were absolutely made of no account. Besides this it was clear that so far from a new system being constructed, a few patches had been sewn on to that which previously existed, and some of its tattered and decried portions cut out; but so far from a new system having been elaborated, all that was done consisted in one considerable change, some cheese-parings, and a few concessions to the teachers; nothing was proposed that could meet the just anticipations of those persons at whose request the Royal Commission had been appointed. Moreover, the Code was so framed as to disturb what existed, and to make further changes necessary. It seemed to have unsettled a great deal, and settled nothing, and what it proposed to do no one could quite understand, as the solution of details was left to be arranged by instructions to H.M.'s inspectors. These, the heads

of the  
ment, a  
extent  
would  
that dis  
reassuri  
contin  
unconsc  
the Edu  
tables o  
was pro  
sprang,  
House o  
is simply  
advocat  
Commis  
the sour  
derived,  
mendati  
time we  
made by  
The  
by the ne  
for each  
'In ever  
least 100  
internal a  
Against  
the requi  
objection  
practicall  
dation, a  
costly ad  
correspon  
manner p  
room for  
school on  
The theor  
could pos  
erected fo  
in averag  
1,741,587  
quiring 10  
the nomin  
places, and  
VOL. XX

of the Department insisted, need not be presented to Parliament, and as the effect of the proposals to an unusually large extent depended upon the manner in which H.M.'s inspectors would be instructed to carry them out, it is unnecessary to say that dissatisfaction reigned everywhere, and in spite of the most reassuring speeches from the heads of the Department increased continually as people examined the Code more carefully. So unconscious were those directly responsible to the country for the Education Department, when they laid the Code upon the tables of the two Houses of Parliament, of the effect of what was proposed, and of the source from which the changes sprang, that the Vice-President is reported to have said in the House of Commons: 'The object of the proposed alterations is simply to endeavour to carry into effect many of the changes advocated by the majority and minority report of the late Commission.' How complete a misrepresentation this is of the sources from which the changes in the new Code were derived, will best be seen by comparing them with the recommendations of the Commission on the subject: at the same time we would point out some of the important suggestions made by that body, which were entirely dropped out.

The first and one of the most important changes proposed by the new Code related to the amount of space to be required for each child attending school. The new rule ran thus: 'In every case the Department will endeavour to secure at least 100 cubic feet of internal space, and 10 square feet of internal area for each unit of average attendance' (art. 85 (a)). Against this there was an immediate outcry, as it increased the requirement of space by 25 per cent. To this demand objection was instantly raised, and it was pointed out that practically there was already much unused school accommodation, and to increase the requirement would only entail costly additions to the present school supply, without any corresponding advantage. For if the law was framed in the manner proposed, all places would be compelled to furnish room for the number of children who ought to be attending school on the basis of allowing the larger amount of space. The theoretical demand of 8 square feet for each child who could possibly attend school had resulted in schools being erected for 5,356,554 children, whilst there were only 3,614,967 in average attendance, so that there were on an average 1,741,587 school places always vacant; if the new rule requiring 10 square feet was insisted upon, it would diminish the nominal amount of school supply by more than a million places, and the London and other school boards would in-

stantly insist upon meeting the theoretical need by erecting new schools, for which scholars could be found only by attracting them from other schools. The effect of this must be utterly to ruin the voluntary schools, as there would practically be more schools than children to use them. To this the President of the Council replied, from his place in the House of Lords, that the rule of the Department was quite misunderstood. He said :

'No hard-and-fast rule was laid down as to the superficial area, such as was suggested by the question, though a rule to that effect existed in the Code of ten years ago ; but the Department would endeavour to secure the 100 cubic feet desired by his right reverend friend. He wished, however, to relieve the anxiety of the managers of existing schools by saying that no undue pressure would be put upon them by the Department if reasonable accommodation were provided for the children.'<sup>1</sup>

The Vice-President, speaking in the House of Commons, was even more explicit :

'There has never been any intention to give immediate application to Art. 85 (a) in the New Code so far as existing schools are concerned ; and in cases in which the Department has sanctioned a certain amount of accommodation for a certain number of scholars such arrangement will not be disturbed.'<sup>2</sup>

The words used in the Code seemed to sanction the possibility of such an interpretation, and no doubt the permanent officials, working in the interests of school boards, had persuaded the heads of the Department that such was their obvious and only meaning ; but unfortunately these superiors had forgotten, if they had ever known, that the old rule respecting space ran thus : 'In administering this article, the Department will endeavour to secure at least 80 cubic feet of internal space and 8 square feet of internal area for each unit of average attendance,'<sup>3</sup> and that every school which failed to secure that amount of space was fined. The words of the two codes, with the exception of those representing figures, were identical ; why should their enforcement be different ? It was no doubt foreseen by those who drew up the Code that so soon as another Ministry came into office the new rule could be insisted upon as rigorously as the old one had been, whilst the odium of it could be thrown upon the Conservative Ministry, by whom it had been introduced.

But then the Vice-President claimed the authority of the

<sup>1</sup> *School Guardian*, April 20, 1889, p. 276.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* May 11, p. 339. <sup>3</sup> Code, 1888, Art. 96 (a).

Comm  
that bo

'W  
within  
of the  
this wo  
is requi  
tors at  
Depart  
increas  
number

There i

'Bef  
made he  
we must  
tary sch  
efficient  
"default  
grounds,  
these imp

The mi  
10 squa  
amount  
attendan  
The art  
was sug  
was mac  
majority  
differenc  
the Code  
school b  
10 squar  
to be at  
claim co

There  
which th  
which no  
As the  
tricts wh  
board ha  
no volunt  
share in t  
that at

<sup>1</sup> Repo



Commission for the changes introduced : let us examine what that body has to say for itself. The majority say :

'We are of opinion that existing schools should gradually, but within reasonable limits of time, be brought up to the higher estimate of the space required for school accommodation. But we think that this would be more advantageously brought about in cases where it is required by pressure exerted on managers through H.M.'s inspectors at the time of their visits than by a hard-and-fast rule of the Department, which might have the effect of requiring a sudden increase of 25 per cent. in the accommodation in a considerable number of schools throughout the country.'<sup>1</sup>

There is then this further recommendation :

'Before we close our recommendations as to the grants to be made henceforth to all public elementary schools, voluntary or board, we must record our opinion that if the managers of a public elementary school, which has once been passed by the Department as efficient and suitable, are ordered by that authority, under pain of "default," to make alterations or additions to the buildings or playgrounds, a grant in aid of the local expenditure required to carry out these improvements should be made by the Education Department.'<sup>2</sup>

The minority 'approve the rule of the Department that 10 square feet and 100 cubic feet should be the minimum amount of accommodation provided for each child in average attendance in all school buildings in future to be erected.'<sup>3</sup> The article, therefore, placed in the Code was stricter than was suggested either by majority or minority, and no mention was made of the grant from the Department on which the majority had laid great stress. A further and most unfortunate difference between the recommendation in the Report and the Code is that by the former no claim could be made by a school board to supply the theoretical want occasioned by 10 square feet having to be provided for each child who ought to be at school, whilst by the wording of the Code such a claim could be made.

There was another point with respect to school supply on which the majority have a very decided recommendation to which no reference has been made in Parliament or elsewhere. As the Act of 1870 is interpreted, in all school board districts whenever more accommodation is needed the school board has the right to provide it, and without its permission no volunteers can erect schools which shall be entitled to share in the Parliamentary grant. The consequence has been that at Swansea and elsewhere school boards, consisting

<sup>1</sup> Report, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 190.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 237-8.

mainly of the 'professed friends of religious liberty,' have refused their consent to the Roman Catholics and others to erect schools for children of their own faith, and have insisted upon compelling them to attend board schools to which their parents conscientiously object. The conclusion at which the majority arrive is: 'The remedy for the grievances complained of seems to us to lie in a more liberal interpretation of the word "suitability," and in a close adherence to the spirit of the provisions of the Act of 1870. The following contention of Mr. Allies, the Secretary of the Catholic Poor School Committee, seems to us worthy of serious consideration.' Regarding the decision as to what schools are unnecessary, he said:

'We should not rest with anything short of its being left still, as the Act leaves it, to the decision of the Education Department, and that the Education Department should not take the decision of the school board as if it were its own, or consider itself bound by the decision of the school board not to give a grant if it thinks proper. I wish to reserve to the Education Department the entire decision. We fully admit that if the Education Department, considering all the circumstances, determines that the school is unnecessary, it may according to the Act give its decision accordingly.'<sup>1</sup>

The minority, being 'the professed friends of religious liberty,' desire to give power to school boards to allow or refuse permission to religious bodies to erect schools for children of their own faith, and are content to see them compelled to attend board schools to which the parents conscientiously object as likely to injure the children's faith and morals.

Another point which is treated with like indifference is the transfer of voluntary schools to school boards. At present an incompetent or slothful or unpopular incumbent can practically deprive the Church for ever of her property in her schools; his want of loyalty to the Church, or tact, or energy, or religious devotion would alienate alike members of the Committee of Management and subscribers, and dispose them to consent to the transfer of their school to a school board, for which all that is needed is a vote from two-thirds of those bodies. The majority recommend:—

'In view of the friction caused by the working of the 23rd section, and the grievances which it appears to have created, we recommend that, in any fresh educational legislation, it be enacted that no transfer of a school held under trust shall take place without the consent of a majority of the trustees, and that the Education Department be

<sup>1</sup> Report, p. 58.

instructed to sanction only such terms of transfer, beyond what is required for the purposes of the Education Acts, as do not interfere with the original trust in the event of a voluntary school being leased to a school board. Provision should also be made that no structural expenses involving a loan should be incurred without the consent of the trustees who lease the building.<sup>1</sup>

The minority would rather increase than diminish the facilities for confiscating the property of the Church, and enabling it to be used for purposes to which those who gave the money for its acquisition would strongly object.

Whilst the recommendations of the Commission are thus partially or wholly ignored by the Code on these important points respecting school supply, it will be seen by reference to the minutes of evidence that what Mr. Patrick Cumin, the permanent secretary to the Department, suggested in his evidence is adopted, clearly showing that his is the authority on which the provisions of the New Code rest, and not the Royal Commission. Mr. Nunn's pamphlet proves this to demonstration.

It may be well to remind our readers, in connexion with this subject, of what occurred a few years since. Some Non-conformists, and especially Wesleyans, felt aggrieved that children of their communion were obliged to attend Church schools in parishes where the population was not large, and petitioned to be allowed to open schools, although the Church schools supplied sufficient accommodation for all the children of the place. The National Society was invited by the Education Department to give its views on the subject. This it did in favour of the application being granted; for, though it fully recognized the inconvenience and possible injury which might be suffered by existing Church schools through losing a portion of the scholars for whom they were erected, it felt strongly the injustice of not meeting as far as possible the conscientious objections of parents; and it held that, so long as the schools were erected and supported in their fair measure by private benevolence, they ought to be allowed by the Department, or the principle of religious liberty would be violated. It would have been different if the erection of board schools had been prayed for; as in that case those who objected to them would have had to furnish a portion of the cost of their erection and support, whilst those who desired them need subscribe nothing, and would probably be persons having no interest in the place. That would be a violation of religious liberty on the other side.

We have examined this question of school supply at length,

<sup>1</sup> Report, p. 59.

not merely because of its intrinsic importance, but also because the treatment of it by the Department forcibly illustrates the manner in which the New Code has been drawn up. Moreover it was the first sacrifice made to the wolves in the hope of averting further opposition to the Code. Our object is to point out the injurious principles embodied in it, and the inconsistencies between the professed intentions of its responsible framers and the provisions contained in it; and not to trespass upon the patience of our readers by dealing with the proposed alterations *seriatim*; we wish only to call attention to two or three of the more prominent of them.

Foremost among these is the manner in which the Government grant was to be meted out to schools. The system of 'payment by results' as now practised was condemned by nearly every witness who gave evidence before the Commission. It was necessary, therefore, to alter this proved evil. To effect this the Commission recommended that there should be a fixed grant of 10s. for every child in average attendance; that individual examination should be treated not as a means of individually determining grants, but merely as testing the progress of all the scholars; that schools should be assessed according to their deserts, especial stress being laid on the three elementary subjects; and that there should be a variable grant averaging not less than 10s. The present average grant is estimated to be rather less than 18s. in 1889, so that the increased cost to the Treasury would be about 400,000*l.* a year, if the suggestions of the Commission were adopted. Beside this it was urged that there should be special assistance given to small country schools, which are often carried on with considerable difficulty at a much larger ratio of cost per child than is required for larger schools.

To appear to comply with these proposals some changes, and, so far as some of them went, good changes, have been proposed. A general grant of 12s., 14s., or 15s. 6*d.* was to be substituted for the existing grants for average attendance, reading, writing, arithmetic, and merit. The calculation was evidently so made that the grant would practically not be increased beyond what it now is; in fact it seems more likely that on the whole it would have been diminished. The Chairman says that in the schools of the London School Board there would be an annual loss of 3,000*l.*, and in the many estimates from various parts of the country of loss and gain from the provisions of the New Code which we have seen the losses preponderate over the gains. Moreover the present grant of 2*l.* or 3*l.* to pupil teachers was to be discontinued in order to

meet so  
schools  
year) w  
meet su  
was offe  
of schoo  
it woul  
money  
grant fo  
populat  
to claim  
ployed,  
costly c  
such sch  
salary;  
number  
require  
Moreov  
in som  
grant c  
as effici  
forfeite  
under w  
were to  
the Dep  
assured  
might c

To  
mention  
limit, fo  
Act of  
paid by  
subscrip  
might  
being r  
12s. 7*d.*  
earlier  
larger s  
now th  
sum fix  
are hig  
subscrip  
where t  
mical a  
scholar

meet some increased assistance proposed for small country schools. But whilst this considerable reduction (38,000*l.* a year) was made from the existing grant for pupil teachers to meet such extra help, the conditions under which that help was offered made it improbable that any considerable number of schools would be in a position to claim it: and, if they were, it would in most cases be at the cost of expending more money than the additional grant would repay. This new grant for small country parishes was limited to schools with a population of less than 400 within two miles of the school; to claim it an expensive certificated teacher must be employed, which would often require the dismissal of the less costly ex-pupil teacher now frequently placed in charge of such schools, and the consequent provision of a much larger salary; moreover a pupil teacher must be employed if the number of scholars exceeded forty, instead of sixty as now required, and the grant was not to exceed 10*l.* in any case. Moreover the limit of 17*s.* 6*d.* was to apply to this grant; so, in some few cases, if from exceptional circumstances the grant could be claimed by a school economically, as well as efficiently, managed, it would be partially if not wholly forfeited by the operation of that limit. As the conditions under which all these grants, ordinary as well as extraordinary, were to be awarded were sacredly kept secret in the bosom of the Department, it was impossible for any managers to feel assured as to the amount of Government help on which they might depend.

To all the proposals there was the fatal objection that no mention was made of the relaxation or repeal of the 17*s.* 6*d.* limit, for which an Act of Parliament is required. By the Act of 1876 this sum had been fixed as that which might be paid by the Department without the amount received from subscriptions and fees equalling the grant, whilst the grant might exceed that sum if it was met by an equal amount being raised. But then the Government grant was only 12*s.* 7½*d.* in 1876, while in 1888 it averaged 17*s.* 6½*d.* In the earlier year there was no chance of a poor school earning a larger sum than that fixed by the statutable limitation; but now the grant to a large proportion of schools exceeds the sum fixed, with this result, that where the school fees charged are high, or the expenditure upon the school from rates or subscriptions extravagant, the whole sum earned is paid; but where the school fees are low, and the management economical as well as efficient, the school is fined for giving its scholars an education for which the State would readily pay

if the children or supporters of the school were rich, but for which it refuses to pay because they are poor. It may be said, if subscribers to voluntary schools would contribute more largely, then the grant might be obtained. But why should they do so when the extra expenditure would not make their school more efficient? And further, it has to be remembered that in many places the supporters of voluntary schools have to pay heavy school board rates which cripple their resources, and make it impossible for them to find a larger proportion of the cost of maintaining their schools. An incumbent receiving 300*l.* a year from tithes would have not infrequently to pay 10*l.* to 15*l.* a year for the support of board schools in his parish, so that money which he might have given to maintain the Church voluntary school is now diverted to an object which he cordially dislikes, and he cannot contribute to the school in which he is interested so much as he would. What is true of the clergyman holds equally good of many of his parishioners. The supporters of board schools, who never voluntarily contribute a penny out of their own pockets for educational purposes, delight in throwing stones at the friends of voluntary schools for not giving more largely towards their maintenance. When all the facts of the case are taken into account such treatment is very unworthy, for it ill becomes those who show their interest in education by compelling other people to pay for what they do to sneer at others who voluntarily give about a million a year for the cause of religious education. And when the money spent on building and enlarging schools is added to the sum required for keeping them in efficiency, they are now supplying that amount beyond what they pay in school board rates; these they share equally with their opponents.

It is unnecessary to say anything about the recommendations of the Commission for providing curricula of instruction for various classes of schools, for improving the moral training imparted in them, for elevating their tone by the employment of visiting masters, &c., partly because all these matters were spoken of at length in a previous number of this *Review*, and partly because they are entirely ignored in the New Code. The only other point in it to which we need call attention is the proposal for establishing day training colleges.

This proposal was made in the baldest possible form. Beyond the fact that there were to be such institutions, that a grant of 25*l.* to each male student, and 20*l.* to each female student, holding a Queen's scholarship would be made through the local Committee, and a further sum of 10*l.* to the Com-

mitte  
grant  
Com  
to th  
cemb  
Com  
woul  
the m  
pract  
upon  
shop,  
class  
be an  
any b  
ing t  
them  
accou  
them.  
either  
efficie  
detail  
wishes  
safer  
little  
posab  
others  
submi

It  
tional  
gaged  
placed  
ance o  
it, wh  
entirel  
and o  
prepar  
Provis  
many  
profess  
were e  
of the  
entirel  
educat  
was lai  
again



mittee towards providing the necessary teaching, that these grants would be made in three instalments, and that the Committee would be required to send a copy of their accounts to the Education Department as soon as possible after December 31 in each year, nothing was said. Of whom the local Committee was to consist; whether any local subscriptions would be required; whether any provision was to be made for the moral or religious training of the students; whether any practising school for teaching them their art would be insisted upon; whether students might work all day in a school, or shop, or warehouse, and receive their education in evening classes without forfeiting their grant; whether there was to be any limit to the number of day college students; whether any binding conditions to secure their becoming and remaining teachers after leaving college would be imposed upon them; were apparently regarded as considerations of too small account to need attention, as no mention is made of any of them. It would seem as if those who drew up the Code were either too little versed in what was needed for organizing an efficient day college to make it safe for them to venture upon details; or else that they thought the arrangements they wished to make were likely to be so unpopular that it was safer to leave them in complete obscurity. It certainly showed little forethought as to the criticism which such a crude proposal must have to encounter from the many experts and others deeply interested in the question to whom it must be submitted.

It is difficult to imagine proposals for altering our educational system less likely to secure the approval of those engaged in the work of education than the New Code recently placed before the country. There was not even an appearance of thoroughness, or finality, or grasp of the subject about it, whilst everything showed that those who drew it up were entirely out of touch with the supporters of voluntary schools, and of all interested in elementary education who were not prepared for the universal establishment of school boards. Provisions were introduced making certain changes on which many teachers had laid stress, but which were important from a professional rather than an educational point of view, and which were evidently inserted in the Code to secure the co-operation of the important and influential body of teachers, whilst it entirely failed to secure the adhesion of any other body of educationists. The consequence was that as soon as the Code was laid on the table of the Houses of Parliament protests against it were poured out from all parts of the country. The

National Society organized an opposition against it, and was powerfully supported by the Diocesan Boards of Education and Diocesan Conferences. It is asserted that more private communications about this Code were made to members of Parliament by their constituents, imploring them to oppose it, than had ever been previously known on any subject. At first the President and Vice-President seemed surprised that everyone did not admire the bantling of which they were the foster parents, and they confidently assured those who complained, that when they had really mastered its provisions, and thoroughly comprehended the manner in which they would work, they would find that they were completely mistaken in supposing that they would not further the great cause of education, and prove most beneficial to all voluntary schools. Gradually the united front of the opposition, and the fact that nearly all experts were on one side, whilst the other was composed chiefly of officials, appeared to shake the confidence of those responsible to the country for the Code. At first the requirement of 10 square feet for each child was to be modified, then to be withdrawn; after that the old Code and the new one were to run concurrently side by side, and managers were to choose which of the two they would work under; a late Vice-President, now in opposition, is said to have claimed that he proposed this plan to the present Lord President, and this we can well believe, as it would have been difficult to suggest a mode of procedure more likely to bring the Government into contempt. Then when remonstrances, private and public, memorials, and petitions had failed to secure a satisfactory settlement, members of the House of Commons loaded the Order Book with motions for rejecting the Code or amending its provisions. And thus its doom was sealed; time pressed; there would not be opportunity for discussing it in detail; and so it was happily withdrawn.

The debate in the House of Commons upon the Education Estimates throws but little new light upon the subject, although the New Code was the topic to which nearly every speaker addressed himself. It is, however, instructive to note that its withdrawal was regretted by the opponents of voluntary schools, who evidently thought that its provisions would work unfavourably to those institutions. There were a few statements made in the debate to which it may be well to call attention. One of these was by the Vice-President of the Department. He found that in the mainly agricultural counties of Buckingham, Hereford, Lincoln, Westmoreland,

and  
liab  
if th  
per c  
addu  
so, hi  
in six  
and  
their  
cient  
an inc  
result  
efficie  
superi  
a com  
another  
the on  
the N  
teache  
toward  
these e  
it is c  
manner  
necessa  
by so  
honour  
same i  
every c  
the me  
during  
not con  
schools.  
the exte  
schools  
the frien  
own poe  
be enan  
schools  
favour,  
quality t  
The  
Cranborn  
of numb  
He said  
'The

and Wilts, only 17 per cent. of the schools, or one in six, were liable to suffer from the 17*s. 6d.* limit ; he therefore argued that if these would suffer by the New Code, the remaining 83 per cent. would gain by it. How they would gain he did not adduce a single argument to show ; but if he could have done so, his argument would have been fatal to his case. For if one in six of the schools were to suffer because they were efficient and the best in their counties, what encouragement would their suffering furnish to the other schools to become efficient ? Suffering pecuniary loss is not generally regarded as an inducement to active exertion ; and yet that must be the result to the remaining 83 per cent. if by extra effort and efficiency they should rise to the position of the 17 per cent. of superior schools that had been thus mulcted. Then, again, a comparison of two statements by the Vice-President on another subject shows that they are slightly inconsistent. On the one side he marvels at the inaction of the teachers, because the New Code 'proposed to relinquish the endorsement of teachers' certificates which they believed had acted cruelly towards many hard-working members of the profession.' As these endorsements are all made by Her Majesty's inspectors, it is clear that, so far as they have been made in the manner indicated, these gentlemen have acted 'cruelly,' and necessarily unjustly, or their action could not be designated by so harsh a term. On the other side, the same right honourable gentleman seems to think it impossible that these same inspectors should not most justly take into account every consideration that could affect their judgment about the merits of a school. Complaints were of course made during the debate that the friends of voluntary schools did not contribute more largely towards the support of their schools. It was evidently forgotten that they are mulcted to the extent of some millions a year for the maintenance of schools of which many of them strongly disapprove, whilst the friends of board schools never give a sixpence out of their own pockets towards the schools with which they profess to be enamoured. Let the rates of the friends of voluntary schools be applied to the schools which they regard with favour, and it would soon be found that in quantity and quality they would leave nothing to be desired.

The most striking speech in the debate was made by Lord Cranborne, who dared boldly to state what is in the minds of numbers of people who have not the courage to utter it. He said :—

'The New Code had been among voluntaryists all over the coun-

try widely unpopular, because it contained certain provisions of an irritating character, and a good deal that was vague. But that would have been got over, if it had only been possible to trust the education authorities. They did not distrust the right hon. gentleman, the Vice-President of the Board ; but they had a profound distrust of the Education Department.'

All churchmen who have had to do with the Department must recognize in these words the echo of their own feelings, and must feel proportionately surprised at Mr. Mundella's hardihood and incapacity to recognize facts when he said in reply :—

'Speaking from what he knew of the Department, and of its traditions under every Vice-President, he believed that it had been perfectly impartial in all its dealings with board and voluntary schools, and if it had any leanings they were almost always in the direction of the voluntary schools, which they were anxious to prevent from going to the wall.'

There was nothing in the debate to mark what would be done next year ; but we cannot wonder at the Vice-President's remark that 'so far as his experience went he thought that one of the most indifferent methods of enjoying life was to have anything like a joint parentage in a revised code.' If we might venture to say so, the opportunity which the present President and Vice-President have enjoyed of making a name for themselves as statesmen by placing the elementary education of the country upon a sound and permanent footing has been almost unique. It is one that the most ambitious man might envy, and one which none but the most industrious, far-seeing, and sympathetic could accomplish. We fear that by not rising to the occasion whilst attempting to deal with the subject, they have made their task more difficult in the future. But notwithstanding that, it will be impossible for them not to deal with it next year, unless very unforeseen events occur, and that being the case we will venture to give them a few hints respecting the course which we think it desirable for them to pursue. At the risk of repeating ourselves we would say emphatically, let them not imagine it possible to accomplish what has to be done without legislation. The 17s. 6d. limit will not stand for a moment against argument. It represents a fine upon efficiency when it is combined with economy ; upon poverty when it is united with self-sacrificing zeal for the welfare of the lowest and poorest class of the community for whom the legislature professes to have regard. Then again it is simply monstrous that elementary schools

shou  
evenin  
that w  
are in  
Powel  
they l  
ought  
cide co  
Govern  
author  
school  
Educa  
to be r  
lation,  
to have  
as muc  
passing  
determ  
Wit  
so muc  
Educat  
blem of  
mentary  
boldly  
would c  
under in  
schools  
all inter  
of it.  
required  
demand  
continue  
now be  
the settl  
visional  
construc  
effected  
and man  
work of  
officials  
will be  
Educatio  
the major  
may and  
them the

should have to pay local rates when Sunday schools and evening schools are exempt, and the work they are doing is that which is ordered by the Legislature. These two points are included in the excellent Bill introduced by Mr. F. S. Powell, and the Government would have done wisely if they had secured its passing into law. Besides this they ought to remove the doubt as to the authority which is to decide concerning the new schools which may be helped with Government grants; this ought to be in the hands of the central authority in Downing Street, and not of local partisans on school boards; moreover the grievance pointed out by the Education Commission respecting the transfer of schools ought to be removed. These changes can only be effected by legislation, and as the Roman Catholics and Wesleyans, who desire to have their own schools, are concerned with most of them as much as Church people, there should be no difficulty in passing the requisite Bill through Parliament, and if it was determinately taken in hand we do not think there would be.

With respect to other provisions of the Code we have said so much in previous articles dealing with the Reports of the Education Commission that we need add but little. The problem of the amount of help which ought to be given to elementary schools out of the Imperial Exchequer should be boldly faced, and so dealt with that for the future the grant would only be increased by the additional number of children under instruction. Sufficient experience of the wants of the schools ought by this time to have been gathered to enable all interested in the question to arrive at a satisfactory solution of it. We have already shown that the additional amount required is not very formidable. Much more will be eventually demanded, if the present system of steady annual growth is continued, than if a permanent arrangement, which would now be considered liberal, is boldly faced. With this part of the settlement, as with others, there ought to be no more provisional arrangements; but the attempt should be made to construct a Code which may be permanent. This can only be effected by those in authority taking counsel with the boards and managers and teachers who are carrying on the practical work of education, and not leaving all to the permanent officials in Downing Street. Much of the information needed will be found in the voluminous evidence gathered by the Education Commission, and most excellent guidance exists in the majority Report; but some important questions of detail may and will arise that need adjustment, and with respect to them there ought to be no hesitation about consulting persons

interested. We heartily trust that what has happened during the past year may act as a warning and as instruction to those responsible for the elementary education of the country, and that with the fear of God before their eyes they may now propose such a settlement of the question as will not only preserve the religious education of, at all events, a portion of the children of the country, but will also have a promise of permanence. Every lover of his country must desire for all thoroughly efficient secular instruction, but he must also desire for it to be given in such a way that religious liberty may not be degraded into a political shibboleth as it has recently been, but that the principle which those words embody may truly represent the spirit in which our educational regulations are framed.

#### ART. IX.—CHRISTIAN SYMBOLISM.

1. *Christian Iconography, or the History of Christian Art in the Middle Ages.* By the late ADOLPHE NAPOLEON DIDRON. Translated from the French by E. J. Millington, and completed, with Additions and Appendices, by Margaret Stokes. (London, 1886.)
2. *Symbols and Emblems of Early and Mediæval Christian Art.* By LOUISA TWINING. New Edition. (London, 1884.)
3. *Early Christian Symbolism in Great Britain and Ireland before the Thirteenth Century, being the Rhind Lectures on Archaeology for 1885.* By J. ROMILLY ALLEN. (London, 1887.)

SYMBOLISM may be defined as the use of visible, material objects to bring before the mind immaterial ideas. These objects may be of any kind, nor is any essential connexion between the symbol and the thing symbolized necessary. It is enough that there is some link between the two which furnishes a mental connexion, so that the sight of the material object at once recalls the idea of which it has been recognized as the symbol.

Symbolism, however, in the sense in which we are now to speak of it—the sense in which the term is used in the works whose titles stand at the head of this article—is restricted to symbolism *in art*; the employment of representations in painting or sculpture, of the pencil or the chisel, to bring

abstr  
inspir  
action  
which  
value  
image  
in all  
symbol  
than in  
to her  
desire  
rent in  
'the lo  
not cha  
perhap  
being t  
and ha  
imposs  
religion  
tion an  
to man  
implant  
its dev  
'testifie  
and art  
abjure  
symboli  
from ser  
be symb  
fection  
object w  
ability  
of those  
the min  
Christ o  
thought  
worship  
idea the  
age. To  
bolism—  
this idea  
Twining  
inner ide

<sup>1</sup> S.  
<sup>2</sup> M.



abstract ideas before the mind, and to recall them with their inspiring, quickening power to the memory as principles of action. And by a still further restriction the symbolism of which we are about to write is *Christian* symbolism. The value and power of symbolical representations, pictures or images of the object of worship or its attributes, are recognized in all religions. No form of religion is entirely destitute of symbolism, though it plays a much larger part in some religions than in others. As Miss Twining has said in the introduction to her excellent work on Christian symbols,<sup>1</sup> although the desire of expressing his conceptions by means of art is inherent in man, yet, in the words of the late Professor Maurice, 'the love of art and symbol, though genuine and human, is not characteristic of all nations in the same degree, of our own perhaps least of all.'<sup>2</sup> The principle of symbolism, therefore, being thus universal, belonging essentially to human nature, and having its chief field in the religions of mankind, it is impossible that it should be absent from the highest form of religion, in which, through the purifying virtue of the Incarnation and the redemptive power of the Cross, all that belongs to man, as man, finds its noblest exercise, and every ability implanted in his nature by God is elevated and glorified by its devotion to the service of the Great Giver. Christianity 'testifies clearly and strongly that the whole realm of nature and art belongs to the redeemed spirit, and that it must not abjure its inheritance.'<sup>3</sup> If religion without some kind of symbolism is impossible, if worship cannot be wholly separated from sensible associations, the symbolism of Christianity must be symbolism in its most perfect form. The degree of perfection attained will necessarily vary with the age, *but the object will at all times be the same*, viz. to consecrate the best ability at command with unsparing pains to the portraying of those scenes and objects which will most vividly present to the mind the great truths with which the eternal life which Christ came to bestow is inseparably bound up, lead the thoughts to holy contemplation and prayer, and help the worshipper to a true and spiritual worship. To be true to the idea the form, however rude, must be the most perfect of its age. To those who look at the earlier fruits of Christian symbolism—often so inartistic, sometimes almost grotesque—with this idea prevailing in their minds, and chiefly desiring, as Miss Twining says, 'to penetrate beneath the outward form to the inner idea it sets forth,' the technical character matters little.

<sup>1</sup> *Symbols and Emblems*, p. ix.

<sup>2</sup> Maurice, *On the Prayer Book*, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Maurice, *ibid.*

'The rudeness of execution or want of skill in design is forgotten, and the *idea* appears pre-eminent, giving a value even to the simplest emblem of Christian art which contains an allusion to something above and beyond itself.'

'It may be,' Miss Twining writes,<sup>1</sup> 'that we can see nothing but poverty of design and execution in some of these rude and strange conceptions. But let us remember how important they once were as expressions of the faith of those by whom they were designed and for whom they were intended. By means of these outward forms Christians were inspired with feelings of devotion and love, and in the absence of books, derived from them their chief knowledge of sacred things. To the unlearned they spoke a clear and intelligible language, relating to all the greatest facts of their religion; and that they had a meaning deep and full of poetry in many instances no one who will endeavour to interpret it can doubt. . . . With regard to some of those representations of the Middle Ages which are more calculated to excite in us feelings of surprise than those belonging to a period of pure and simple faith, we must remember that however strange they may appear to us they excited no irreverent feelings in the minds of those who executed and who were familiar with them. Much that we are accustomed to say in words the artists of those days clothed in the language of form, and the representations of art were of course reflections of the mind and faith of the period.'

The purpose of Christian symbolism, it must be borne in mind, is not historical but religious. Its representations are primarily means of kindling devotion, of instructing the mind, and elevating the affections. Even if an historical scene is depicted, such as the Nativity or the Adoration of the Magi, or one of the New Testament miracles, or the Ark of Noah, the History of Jonah, Daniel in the Lions' Den, the Three Children in the Babylonian Furnace, or other Old Testament subjects, it is not so much to impress the event on the mind as to convey the special teaching that event was intended to impart. Thus to St. Gregory Nyssen a picture of the Sacrifice of Isaac was a type of the Passion which he could never look on without tears.<sup>2</sup> The pictures and symbols with which the walls of our earlier churches were so profusely covered were not intended for decoration. Teaching was their first purpose, not ornament. We need hardly remind our readers that St. Paulinus of Nola, the friend of St. Augustine, early in the fifth century tells us expressly<sup>3</sup> that his object in having the walls of the basilica he had erected in honour of St. Felix painted with sacred scenes was the instruction of the illiterate peasants,

<sup>1</sup> *Symbols and Emblems*, p. xii.

<sup>2</sup> Labbe, *Concil.* vii. 736.

<sup>3</sup> Paulin. Nolan. *De Fel. Nat. Carm.* ix. 541-94.

only  
feast  
night  
the pi

W  
Italy,  
paintin  
at Bish  
things

'in ord  
entering  
either b  
be led t  
or havin  
eyes, m  
tion.'<sup>1</sup>

As  
tions w  
looked  
richnes  
'exceed  
those w  
worship  
pression  
and tru  
walls,' v

'The  
things no  
picture w  
the hum  
Mother c

<sup>1</sup> Bede.

<sup>2</sup> Joan  
γράμμασι μ  
ὁ λόγος, το

<sup>3</sup> St. C  
γραφῇ σιω

<sup>4</sup> Joan

VOL. X

only recently converted to the faith, who flocked thither on feast days, and were too much in the habit of spending the night in eating and drinking to excess. For this profanation the pictures were intended to supply a remedy.

‘Visum nobis utile totis  
Felicitis domibus pictura illudere sancta,  
Si forte attonitas hæc per spectacula mentes  
Agrestem caperet fucata coloribus umbra  
Dum fallit pictura famem, sanctasque legenti  
Historias castorum operum subrepat honestas  
Exemplis inducta piis.’

With the same view Benedict Biscop, on his return from Italy, where he had realized the teaching power of symbolical paintings, decorated the roof and walls of the church he built at Bishop’s Wearmouth with pictures of Divine persons and things which he had brought back with him,

‘in order that all, especially those who knew not how to read, on entering the church, whichever way they turned their eyes, might either behold the ever-beloved image of Christ and of His saints; or be led to more watchful meditation on the grace of the Incarnation; or having the strictness of the Last Judgment, as it were, before their eyes, might be reminded of the duty of more searching self-examination.’<sup>1</sup>

As we have said, the first object of these pictorial decorations was the instruction and spiritual benefit of those who looked on them. If they imparted to the Church greater richness and beauty, and rendered the House of God more ‘exceeding magnifical,’ it was a result not to be despised by those who desired to give their very best to God and His worship; but it was only a secondary end. Religious impression was their primary aim. ‘Pictures,’ it has been often and truly said, ‘are the books of the unlearned.’<sup>2</sup> ‘The dumb walls,’ writes St. Gregory Nyssen, ‘speak and edify.’<sup>3</sup>

‘They speak,’ says St. John Damascene;<sup>4</sup> ‘they are neither dumb things nor senseless blocks, like the idols of the heathen; but every picture we behold in a church relates, as if in articulate words, either the humiliation of Christ as man or the wondrous deeds of the Mother of God, or the conflicts and exploits of the saints. Such

<sup>1</sup> Beda, *Vita Quinque SS. Abbat.* § 6, pp. 374-6, ed. Moberly.

<sup>2</sup> Joann. Damascen. *De Imagin.* Orat. i. 708, ed. Basil, 1575: ὅπερ τοῖς γράμμασι μνησθένους ἡ βιβλος, τοῦτο τοῖς ἀγραμμάτοις ἡ εἰκὼν, καὶ ὅπερ τῇ ἀκοῇ ὁ λόγος, τοῦτο τῇ ὁράσει ἡ εἰκὼν, νοητῶς δὲ αὐτῇ ἐνοούμεθα.

<sup>3</sup> St. Greg. Nyssen, *Orat. in Theod.* iii. 737, ed. Migne: οἶδε γὰρ καὶ γραφῇ σιωπῶσα ἐν τοίχῳ λαλεῖν, καὶ τὰ μέγιστα ὠφελεῖν.

<sup>4</sup> Joann. Damasc. *Adv. Const.* vol. i. p. 619, ed. 1712.

paintings awaken the feelings and enlarge the intellect, and rouse us in marvellous and unspeakable ways to emulate those whom they represent.<sup>1</sup>

Of the three works on Christian symbolism the titles of which stand at the head of this article each approaches the subject from a different direction and with a somewhat different object. The great work of the late M. Didron on what he preferred to designate *Christian Iconography*, which deservedly occupies the first place, was originally commenced with the purpose of furnishing a complete history of Christian art from the earliest times down to the epoch when symbolic representations finally gave way to historical pictures. Unfinished as it unhappily is, as far as it goes it carries out its purpose with the greatest fidelity, displaying a laboriousness of research, an accuracy of observation, and a keenness of interpretation seldom if ever equalled, and never surpassed by any investigator of ancient art. But the work proposed was too gigantic for a single lifetime. The very magnitude of the scheme was a bar to its accomplishment. Only the first division of the work as planned by the author—*L'Histoire de Dieu*—was published by him, and though he never gave up the idea of completing it, and his collections were continually growing in bulk and interest, no more was ever published; the second division, *The History of Good and Evil Angels*, was in the course of preparation, and portions of it from time to time appeared in various archæological journals, but the other divisions, containing the personages and historical scenes of the Old and New Testament, as well as those of mediæval legend—so comprehensive was his scheme—were never even begun. The additions made in the last edition of the translation of the manual, by the learned and accomplished pen of Miss Margaret Stokes—of which we hope to speak more in detail hereafter—have rendered the book a little less incomplete. But it is confessedly only a magnificent fragment, the perfection of the workmanship of which intensifies the regret at its unfinished state.

The aim of the second work, Miss Twining's *Symbols and Emblems of Early and Mediæval Christian Art*, which, after being many years out of print and repeatedly asked for in vain, has been reprinted in a more convenient and portable form, is more restricted. The ground covered is less extensive than that of M. Didron, and to a large extent the character of the subjects illustrated is different. Miss Twining's purpose, as described by herself, has been 'to collect and arrange in chronological order the principal forms that have been used

sym-  
lead-  
art a  
ings  
and  
Such  
Twin  
torial  
adjun  
emery  
First  
mon  
forms  
the fis  
Good  
breath  
cross  
the Pa  
the Re  
tions s  
Trinity  
symbol  
her sa  
vention  
of the  
by a g  
drapery  
caldr  
The  
Twini  
'there w

<sup>1</sup> Syn  
<sup>2</sup> On  
represent  
proceedi  
wards an  
head.  
<sup>3</sup> On  
Allen's le  
consulted  
woodcuts  
mentions  
symbolica  
real anim  
animals l  
'either to  
as best th

symbolically in the different periods of art,' with the view of leading to 'a better understanding of the many treasures of art and antiquity that are to be found wherever our wanderings may take us, by assisting persons to read their meaning and to look through the symbol to the thing signified by it.'<sup>1</sup> Such being the aim in view, the subjects selected by Miss Twining for illustration are more frequently portions of pictorial or sculptural representations than entire compositions; adjuncts rather than complete works. Thus we have the Hand emerging from the clouds—'Dextera Dei'—as the type of the First Person of the Trinity; Christ symbolized by the sacred monogram or labarum, and by the Cross, in its many varied forms, as well as by animals of various kinds, the lamb, the lion, the fish, and represented by the familiar pagan figures of the Good Shepherd, and by Orpheus taming the beasts, thus breathing a new and higher spirit into old pagan forms; the cross and the instruments of the Crucifixion as symbols of the Passion, and the peacock and the phoenix as symbols of the Resurrection; the dove in countless forms and combinations symbolizing the Holy Spirit; symbols of the Blessed Trinity; symbolical subjects from the Old and New Testament; symbols of the Evangelists, of the Apostles, of the Church and her sacraments; the soul represented, according to the conventional type, as a naked child proceeding from the mouth of the dying person, received, according to its spiritual state, by a good or by a bad angel,<sup>2</sup> carried upwards in the folds of drapery or cast into the mouth of a monster or into a heated caldron.

The series continues with symbolical animals.<sup>3</sup> As Miss Twining says—

'there was hardly an object in the kingdom of Nature which did not

<sup>1</sup> *Symbols and Emblems*, p. vii.

<sup>2</sup> On the early Norman font at Lenton, near Nottingham, there is a representation of the Crucifixion with the two thieves, the soul of each proceeding out of his mouth in the form of a child, the one soaring upwards and the other falling downwards into the open jaws of a monstrous head.

<sup>3</sup> On the subject of symbolical animals the sixth of Mr. Romilly Allen's lectures, that on the 'Mediæval Bestiaries,' should by all means be consulted as containing copious information illustrated with numerous woodcuts on this 'curious system of mystical zoology.' Mr. Allen mentions one great difficulty which every student of our own native symbolical sculptures meets with at the outset, the entire unlikeness to real animals their representations offer. The artists who carved the animals had evidently never seen actual specimens of them, and had 'either to draw on their imaginations or follow the written descriptions as best they could' (*Rhind Lectures*, p. 357).

form part of the symbolism of the early Christians, who looked upon the whole outer world as a mirror wherein were reflected the higher truths of the invisible kingdom, and as symbolic of Salvation through Christ. Various kinds of Animals were considered by them as types of different qualities or virtues, or even as emblems of the Saviour and of Christians in general.<sup>1</sup>

Of these symbolic representations one of the earliest and most frequent was that of the stag or hart, which, in allusion to Psalm xlii. 1, was used as a type of the Christian soul eagerly thirsting for the waters of salvation. The ox and the ass have their place at the manger of the Nativity, the former typifying the Jews, the latter the Gentiles, together adoring the Saviour of mankind, whose birth had made both one. The lion, traditionally sleeping with its eyes open, appears as the symbol of watchfulness, combined with courage and strength, as the base of pillars at the church porch and at the foot of ambons or pulpits.

'Est leo, sed custos, oculis qui dormit apertis,  
Templorum idcirco ponitur ante fores.'<sup>2</sup>

In accordance with the other legendary tale that the lion's cubs are brought forth dead, and are called to life on the third day by the male lion breathing upon them, the lion is also a symbol of the resurrection of Christ. The unicorn takes its place among symbolic animals as a type of purity and strength. 'The horn was considered to be an emblem of the Cross and was believed to be an antidote for poison.' By a further development of the symbol 'during the Middle Ages the fable or legend of the unicorn was a frequent and favourite illustration of the doctrine of the Incarnation, for it was said that, although wild and fierce in its nature, it could only be caught and tamed by a virgin of pious, holy life, who thus became the image of the Virgin Mary and the unicorn the type of Christ Himself.'<sup>3</sup> From animals Miss Twining passes to birds—the dove, the recognized symbol of the Holy Spirit as well as of the souls of the faithful departed, flying like doves to the windows of their house in Paradise (Isaiah lx. 8); the pelican, an equally frequent though later symbol of Christ—'nostro Pellicano,' as He is styled by Dante in his *Paradiso*<sup>4</sup>—according to

<sup>1</sup> *Symbols and Emblems*, p. 177.

<sup>2</sup> Alciati, *Emblemata*.

<sup>3</sup> *Symbols and Emblems*, p. 186.

<sup>4</sup> 'Questi è colui che giacque sopra il petto

Del nostro Pellicano.'—Dante, *Paradiso*, canto xxv. v. 112.

The story of the young pelicans being killed by the parent birds and brought to life again is thus told by St. Augustine: 'Dicuntur hæ aves tanquam colaphis rostrorum occidere parvulos filios suos eosdemque in nido occisos

popul  
acco  
to life  
birds  
of wa  
waitin  
and a  
St. Pe  
to by  
popul  
garde  
type o  
resurre

Sy  
flower  
lily—a  
of hop  
trium  
aureol  
dissert  
The v  
a comp  
'to see  
the var  
measur  
plates  
ten, or  
tration  
delinea

a se lug  
nerare e  
Fortasse  
illi cong  
Enarra

<sup>1</sup> Au  
omnium  
in this p  
proved i  
partaker  
caused p  
The sam  
At the e  
more dr  
corpulen  
effect of  
animals,  
flesh.

<sup>2</sup> Ch



popular belief nourishing its offspring with its own blood, or according to another version of the legend bringing them to life again by the same means when killed by the parent birds or stung to death by a serpent; the cock, the emblem of watchfulness, according to Bede 'like the souls of the just waiting for the dawn after the darkness of this world's night,' and appearing in the catacomb pictures in connexion with St. Peter and the Passion; and finally the peacock, referred to by Augustine<sup>1</sup> as an emblem of immortality, from the popular belief that its flesh was incorruptible, and also regarded, when standing on a globe with outspread tail, as a type of the glorified believer soaring from the earth at the resurrection of the just.

Symbolical animals are followed by symbolical trees and flowers—the vine, the palm, the cypress, the olive, and the lily—and the list closes with symbolical objects—the anchor of hope, the chaplet of victory, the banner of resurrection triumph, and the circle of eternity. The nimbus and the aureola, exhaustively treated of by M. Didron in the opening dissertation of his treatise,<sup>2</sup> form two supplementary chapters. The value of Miss Twining's unpretending little volume as a companion in travel, helping us (to adopt her own words) 'to see and comprehend with understanding eyes and mind the various objects around us in art and archæology,' may be measured by the number of illustrations it contains. The plates number ninety-two, many of which include eight or ten, or even more, separate subjects. The individual illustrations cannot be much under a thousand. Accuracy of delineation, not artistic beauty, has been Miss Twining's object,

a se lugere per triduum. Postremo dicunt matrem seipsam graviter vulnerare et sanguinem suum super filios fundere quo illi perfusi reviviscunt. Fortasse hoc verum, fortasse falsum sit; tamen si verum est, quemadmodum illi congruat qui nos vivificavit sanguine suo videte.—Aug. *In Psalm. CI. Enarrat.*

<sup>1</sup> August. *De Civitate Dei*, l. xxi. c. 4. 'Quis enim nisi Deus Creator omnium dedit carni pavonis mortui ne putresceret?' Augustine asserts in this passage that the incorruptibility of the peacock's flesh had been proved in his own experience at Carthage. A peacock of which he had partaken at table, was served up again after an interval which would have caused putrescence in any other cooked meat, without any offensive smell. The same occurred at the end of a month: 'idem quod erat inventum est.' At the end of a year the only change was that it had become somewhat more dry and shrunken. 'Idemque post annum nisi quod aliquantum corpulentia siccoris et compactionis fuit.' Those who have observed the effect of the hot and drying winds from the African deserts on dead animals, will see nothing miraculous in the preservation of the peacock's flesh.

<sup>2</sup> *Christian Iconography*, vol. i. pp. 22–163.

and that she has secured. A more delightful and instructive *Vade-mecum* for the intelligent traveller can hardly be named. It should find a place in the equipment of every tourist visiting any part of the Continent, more especially Italy.

The object of Mr. Romilly Allen's *Rhind Lectures* is more limited than that of either of the before-named works. The 'Early Christian Symbolism' of which he treats is that of 'Great Britain and Ireland.' His chief aim in preparing and delivering these lectures 'has been a patriotic one, to endeavour to make his countrymen take a greater interest in the art and monuments of the Early Christian period in Great Britain,' and to recall the almost forgotten truth that 'there was once a National School of Art in this country, entirely distinct from that of Greece or Rome.' Few, comparatively, are aware of the early art treasures still existing in our islands, which, if rude and inartistic, are of the highest historical and religious interest. In Mr. Allen's words 'Great Britain, owing to its geographical position having made certain parts of it safe asylums for Christianity whilst the rest of Europe was being overrun by northern paganism, possesses a series of monuments which are quite unique and of the highest possible value as illustrating history in its darkest period.' The protest Mr. Allen makes against the inexplicable neglect with which these priceless monuments have been regarded—we hope there is a real change for the better in this respect—by 'the authorities who direct our public museums,' and their too often entirely unprotected state, exposing them to the 'brutal stupidity which in a few minutes irreparably mutilates the work of the pious reverence of former generations,' is still, alas! too much needed. The monuments of our native Christian Symbolism are too frequently perishing before our eyes, without any well-directed endeavour to save from destruction these memorials of a sacred past, which 'show how the bright light of Christianity spread over Great Britain, destroying Saxon heathenism in its course, and leaving its traces . . . in the hard stone of the crosses of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.'<sup>1</sup> Sir John Lubbock's Act for the Preservation of Ancient Monuments is one great step in the right direction, but it is too limited in its scope and too difficult to set in motion for very much practical benefit to be expected from it. Many of the more valuable memorials of our primæval Christianity are so widely scattered, and so comparatively insignificant in size, that they hardly admit of being properly catalogued and safeguarded.

<sup>1</sup> *Rhind Lectures*, Preface, p. vii.

W  
Iconog  
which  
already  
which  
his de  
transla  
ment i  
willing  
called  
accomp  
on the  
perform  
other  
especia  
M. Dic  
ment i  
volume  
volume  
For th  
M. Dic  
work, l  
she mo  
her ad  
of who  
lower,'  
all the  
task pr  
Stokes  
tian Sc  
brough  
Mount  
the *Bib*  
antityp  
veloped  
architec  
cathedr  
M. Did  
in App  
ing the  
ing. V  
helps sc  
To  
chief ob  
purpose  
mistake

We must return for a few minutes to M. Didron's *Christian Iconography*, that we may speak more fully of the portions for which we are indebted to Miss Margaret Stokes. We have already referred to the unhappily incomplete condition in which the learned and accomplished author left the work at his decease. This necessarily led to Mr. Millington's English translation also remaining a fragment. The publishers, unwilling that the work should remain unfinished, most wisely called in the aid of Miss Stokes—already well known as an accomplished student and writer in this branch of art—to carry on the work, a difficult and laborious task, which she has performed with the ability which all who know that lady's other contributions to Christian art and early architecture, especially that of her native island, were fully prepared for. M. Didron's *Iconography*, as published by the French Government in 1843, extended no further than p. 82 of the second volume of the English edition. All beyond that point—the volume containing 420 pages—is the work of Miss Stokes. For the first sixty pages Miss Stokes had contributions of M. Didron to French periodical literature as the basis of her work, but from that point this help failed her. And though she modestly disclaims the merit of originality, and describes her additions as 'mainly founded on the writings of M. Didron,' of whose 'footsteps' she declares herself 'an humble follower,' Miss Stokes is obliged to own herself responsible for all the text following on p. 145. Her accomplishment of her task proves how admirably she was qualified for it. Miss Stokes has added treatises on the 'Iconography of the Christian Scheme' as set forth in the 'Byzantine Guide to Painting,' brought to light by M. Didron in one of the monasteries of Mount Athos, on the *Speculum Humanæ Salvationis*, and on the *Biblia Pauperum*, with their instructive series of types and antitypes from the Old and New Testament respectively, developed by Michael Angelo in the Sistine Chapel, and by the architects and sculptors of Chartres and other mediæval cathedrals. The 'Byzantine Guide,' illustrated by notes by M. Didron, printed in Appendix ii., and the *Biblia Pauperum*, in Appendix iii., cannot fail to form valuable guides in tracking the intricacies of mediæval art and interpreting its meaning. We are much indebted to Miss Stokes for placing such helps so readily within our reach.

To return to the general subject: Teaching being the chief object of Christian symbolism, it was essential to its purpose that the lessons conveyed should be plain and unmistakable. The meaning of the symbol must be too clear

to be missed. If the mind of the beholder was in any way distracted by speculations as to its significance, it would not be so ready to receive the holy lessons it was calculated to convey. A stereotyped form, therefore, though entirely at variance with the recognized principles of modern art, was a first essential in early symbolic representations. The same principle led also to a narrow limitation of the subjects represented. To wander over the whole field of Old and New Testament history, selecting subjects at will, would create a hopeless confusion in the minds of those for whose spiritual benefit they were chiefly intended. These were, as a rule, unlearned and ignorant persons, unable to read the Scriptures even if copies of them were at their command, and whose knowledge of their contents was limited to a few leading events, either typical of the great redemptive act of Christ and the sacraments of the Church, or to subjects from the New Testament actually representing them. Christian symbolism has been well defined by Mr. Romilly Allen<sup>1</sup>

'as a means of conveying ideas and facts to the mind by representations, which are, in the first instance, merely pictorial, but by frequent repetition gradually assume certain stereotyped forms. It is, in fact, a conventional system whereby pictures of historical scenes or natural objects are made use of to express something beyond what appears to the eye; and set in motion a train of thought leading the mind on to contemplate those abstract ideas that are associated directly, or otherwise, with the thing portrayed. For instance, the scene which shows Noah in the Ark<sup>2</sup> is pictorially merely a man in a boat; but symbolically is intended to teach the doctrine that, as God saved Noah from destruction in the waters of the Flood, so will Christ deliver those who believe in Him from spiritual danger' [and, we may add, the Holy Spirit, typified by the dove, will impart the olive branch of heavenly peace].

Thus we find an unwritten rule established in the earliest ages of the Church, virtually prescribing not only what subjects were admissible in symbolic art, but the very form and manner in which they were to be depicted. What we may call

<sup>1</sup> Romilly Allen, *Rhind Lectures*, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Few subjects are found so frequently in the catacomb paintings and on the sarcophagi and on our early Norman fonts as that of Noah, usually represented as taking in the dove. These representations 'are of the most abstract possible character. The word ark is taken literally to mean a chest, and Noah is seen dressed in a tunic, standing up in a square box'—many sizes too small for him, to say nothing of his family and the animals—'the lid of which is open and provided in many cases with a hasp and a lock. His hands are either extended towards the dove, which is flying in the air with an olive branch in its mouth, or are raised in the ancient attitude of prayer' (*Rhind Lectures*, p. 233).

'hier-  
ness  
allow  
lated  
mosa  
assign  
the  
Didro  
figure  
nest  
that  
the of  
behol

T  
know  
and w  
which  
loculi  
the O  
as has  
sequ  
in Ve  
their  
of Ch  
(excl  
with

<sup>1</sup> T  
lated b  
inventi  
Nican.  
Christa

<sup>2</sup> D  
<sup>3</sup> 'J

how it  
figures  
ing fr  
arrived  
surrou  
church  
figures  
Didron  
memor  
much l  
us all w  
brushes  
tures, p  
to Pain  
second

<sup>4</sup> 'P

'hieratic types' were prescribed by the Christian consciousness of the Early Church, from which no departure was allowed.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, so permanent did the type once formulated become that a very small fragment of a painting or a mosaic is often enough to enable us with perfect certainty to assign its subject. If the artist thus became little more than the mechanical reproducer of stereotyped forms—in M. Didron's words 'the slave of the theologian, drawing his figures by tradition, as by instinct the swallow builds her nest or the bee constructs its comb'<sup>2</sup>—it must be remembered that æsthetic beauty and the display of artistic skill were not the objects contemplated, but the religious edification of the beholder.<sup>3</sup>

The earliest examples of Christian symbolic paintings known to us are those which so profusely decorate the ceilings and walls of the catacomb chapels at Rome and Naples, and which are also found on the gilded glasses discovered in the *loculi*, and on the sarcophagi. These include subjects both from the Old and from the New Testament, the former being selected, as has been already noticed, according to the principle subsequently laid down by St. Augustine—'Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet; Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet'—from their recognized acceptance as types of the redemptive acts of Christ. The cycle of Old Testament subjects here found (excluding those which occur only once or twice), are the Fall, with Adam and Eve and the Serpent;<sup>4</sup> the Sacrifices of Cain

<sup>1</sup> The unwritten tradition of the Early Church was subsequently formulated by authoritative enactment: 'Non est imaginum structura pictorum inventio sed ecclesiæ catholicæ privata legislatio et traditio' (*Concil. Nicæn. Secund. Act. vi.*; Labbe, vol. vii. col. 831). Cf. Lord Lindsay's *Christian Art*, vol. i. p. 72.

<sup>2</sup> Didron, *Manuel d'Iconographie Chrétienne*, p. ix.

<sup>3</sup> 'M. Didron, when visiting Greece, made it his business to find out how it was that the decorators of churches were able to repeat the same figures and inscriptions, generation after generation, without ever deviating from the prescribed copies. The mystery was solved when he arrived at Mount Athos, and ascending the scaffold he found the painter surrounded by his pupils, engaged in ornamenting the narthex of the church with frescoes. The master rapidly sketched the outlines of the figures entirely from memory, without ever making a mistake. On M. Didron's expressing his astonishment at the skill and prodigious effort of memory involved in the process, the artist replied, "But, sir, all this is much less wonderful than you suppose; for, see, here is a MS. which tells us all we ought to do. Here we are taught to prepare our plaster, our brushes, our colours, to compose and arrange our pictures"' (*Rhind Lectures*, p. 182). The MS. in question was a copy of the 'Byzantine Guide to Painting,' which, as we have said above, is given by Miss Stokes in the second appendix to her edition of Didron's manual.

<sup>4</sup> 'No scene is found so universally throughout the whole range of

and Abel; Noah in the Ark, taking in the Dove; the Sacrifice of Isaac: scenes from the history of Moses (not unfrequently identified by inscriptions with St. Peter as the supposed lawgiver of the New Testament, 'the leader of the new Israel,' as Prudentius calls him), (a) Moses Loosing his Sandals; (b) the Passage of the Red Sea (not found in paintings, only on sarcophagi); (c) Striking the Rock (one of the most constantly recurring symbols, typifying the waters of baptism and the supplies of spiritual grace and strength from the riven Rock Jesus Christ); (d) the Gathering of the Manna and Quails; (e) the Giving of the Tables of the Law: the Ascension of Elijah; the History of Jonah, (a) swallowed by the sea monster, (b) disgorged, (c) reposing beneath the gourd; the Three Children in the Furnace; Daniel in the Lions' Den; Job on the Dunghill. Subjects of rare occurrence are Tobias with the Fish, Susanna and the Elders, and David with his Sling, which rather unaccountably appears only once, as far as is known, in the whole range of Christian art.<sup>2</sup>

Christian art from the earliest times, and in none have the conventional features varied less' (*Rhind Lectures*, p. 188). The earliest dated example is that important landmark in the history of Christian art the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus at St. Peter's in Rome, dated A.D. 359. The lower part of this elaborate sarcophagus exhibits a series of carvings indicating the sense entertained by the Early Church of the unity of the two Testaments and of the symbolical meaning of the acts of Moses as a type of Christ. A lamb holds the rod and strikes water from the rock, receives the tables of the law, raises Lazarus, multiplies the loaves, and baptizes another lamb (symbolizing the Baptism of Christ by John). Three lambs stand as the three children in the furnace. For these curious subjects see Miss Twining's *Symbols and Emblems*, pl. xxxix. fig. 1; Appell, *Monuments of Early Christian Art*, p. 9.

<sup>1</sup> This subject is extremely rare. A fresco, certainly to be identified with the falling of the manna, was discovered in 1863 in the cemetery of St. Cyriaca, and described and figured by De Rossi in his *Bullettino* in the October of the same year (p. 76), see Martigny, *Dict. des Ant. Chrét.*, art. 'Manne,' p. 386. Dr. Appell, *u.s.* pp. 36, 40, cites other examples from a sarcophagus at Marseilles figured by Millin (pl. lviii. No. 2), and from one discovered at Arles, now in the museum at Aix. These representations have an evident Eucharistic reference, based on our Lord's description of Himself as the True Bread which came down from heaven in John vi. Nor is it at all improbable that a large number of the catacomb pictures commonly identified with the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, which also clearly bear a Eucharistic reference, more really belong to the fall of the manna. This was suggested by Bosio, and the suggestion is accepted by Martigny (see Bosio, p. 251). The bearded figure usually seen with the wonder-working rod touching the baskets is certainly more like the type of Moses than that of Christ. But in this instance, as in the striking of the rock, the symbolism of the Old and New Testament may probably be combined.

<sup>2</sup> This figure of David holding his sling and preparing to wield it is found among other symbolical subjects on the ceiling of a cubiculum in

The  
The sub  
tion of  
Paralyti  
Issue of  
at Cana  
Raising  
umphal  
Christ a  
nesareth  
occurre  
are the  
the Bap  
The rea  
exclusio  
sacrame  
nence a  
determin  
Church  
bodying  
everyday  
first per  
graved  
the age  
Scriptur  
they ha  
become  
lessons  
was, as  
aesthetic  
quote M  
'the Ch  
a smaller  
history a  
reference  
known to  
a system  
salient p  
not neces  
faith.'<sup>2</sup>

the Cem  
i. 54).

<sup>1</sup> See  
<sup>2</sup> Cf.  
Lindsay  
sight mo



The cycle of New Testament subjects is equally restricted. The subjects that may be certainly identified are the Adoration of the Magi (one of the most frequent), the Healed Paralytic carrying his Bed, the Cure of the Woman with the Issue of Blood, the Healing of the Blind Man, the Miracle at Cana and the Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes, the Raising of Lazarus (one of perpetual occurrence), the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, Pilate Washing his Hands, Christ and His Apostles on the Shore of the Lake of Genesareth with the Bread and Fish. Subjects of less frequent occurrence, and some of them of rather doubtful identification, are the Annunciation (?), Christ and the Woman of Samaria, the Baptism of Christ, and the Wise and Foolish Virgins.<sup>1</sup> The reason for the selection of some of these subjects, to the exclusion of others, by which the great redemptive and sacramental truths the Church desired to bring into prominence are even more plainly illustrated, it is not easy to determine. The probable explanation is that the mind of the Church having once seized upon these Scriptural facts as embodying those cardinal truths, they found a place in her everyday oral teaching, so that having been once selected, at first perhaps almost accidentally, by continual use they engraved themselves indelibly on the Christian consciousness of the age and spoke a language understood by all. Other Scripture scenes might have spoken even more plainly had they happened to have been selected, but those chosen had become familiar and needed no explanation to render their lessons universally intelligible. The principle of selection was, as we have already said, not historical teaching, still less æsthetic beauty, but the edification of the beholders. To quote Miss Stokes—

'the Christian painters on the catacombs limited themselves to a smaller cycle of subjects [than those of the East], and, setting history and chronology aside, treated those subjects solely with reference to some hidden moral or devotional truth which they were known to signify. Thus the events recorded were turned to symbols; a system of such symbols was developed which was expressive of the salient points in religion. A hieratic cycle of subjects came into use, not necessarily for doctrinal purposes, but as expressive of religious faith.'<sup>2</sup>

the Cemetery of Callixtus (Bosio, p. 289; Bottari, tav. lxiii.; Arringhi, i. 54).

<sup>1</sup> See Perret, *Les Catacombes*, ii. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. for this cycle the *Apost. Const.* v. c. 7; Didron, ii. 194. Lord Lindsay says, *u. s.* p. 47: 'Nothing probably will surprise you at first sight more than the paucity of subjects selected from the history of our

The subjects selected had a mutual interdependence, and formed parts of a great scheme of Christian teaching by typical parallelism, in which the Old Testament was made to illustrate the New, and God's sundry and partial revelations of Himself and His Will in old times were shown to form part of one harmonious whole with the full manifestation in His Son.

What Miss Stokes calls 'the framework of the Christian scheme as first conceived in Western Christian art' may be thus arranged:—

THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS: (1) BAPTISM—Noah in the Ark, Moses Striking the Rock; (2) THE EUCHARIST—the Fall of the Manna, the Miracle at Cana, the Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes, Christ and His Apostles on the Shore of Gennesareth, the Congregation seated at Table. TRIUMPH OVER SUFFERING<sup>1</sup>—the Three Children in the Furnace, Daniel in the Lions' Den. THE PASSION—Job on the Dung-hill, Jonah cast into the Sea and swallowed by the Sea Monster. THE RESURRECTION—the Deliverance of Jonah, the Raising of Lazarus. THE ASCENSION—the Rapture of Elijah. CHRIST AND THE CHURCH—the Good Shepherd, the Fisherman and the Fish, Christ with the Book, and standing or seated among His Disciples, the Orante. THE CALL OF THE GENTILES—the Visit of the Magi, Christ and the Woman of Samaria.

How deeply and permanently these symbolic subjects were stamped on the mind of the early Church is shown by their appearing in countries very far remote from the great centre of Christian teaching and Christian art. Mr. Romilly Allen, in his *Rhind Lectures*,<sup>2</sup> has collected examples of a large proportion of them from the high crosses of Ireland, and from the tympanums of Norman doorways and from Norman fonts. We must refer to the lectures themselves for illustrations and descriptions of these most interesting sculptures. We can do no more here than call our readers' attention to them as a little-known but most instructive department of Christian symbolism. The Fall is one of the most frequently occurring subjects. It is found on the profusely sculptured Saviour, and the exclusion of almost every one of those most interesting scenes which marked His sojourn upon earth, and have been the cherished theme of Christian art in every later age . . . while 'the subjects of the Old Testament are repeated at least ten times more frequently than those selected from the New.'

<sup>1</sup> These two subjects were also regarded as symbols of the Resurrection. Irenæus, v. c. 5; Tertullian, *De Resurr. Carn.* c. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Sect. iv. pp. 182-235, v. 236-333.

cross  
Moon  
fonts  
in F  
Labo  
built  
which  
A se  
Noah  
with  
(2) h  
in pr  
souls  
succe  
hum  
Noah  
cross  
of No  
close  
Sacr  
whole  
Patri  
cross  
sever  
conve  
Isaac  
to be  
engag  
to be  
of a c  
lion b  
the c

<sup>1</sup> T  
being v  
of thre  
catchin  
another  
part hi  
that we  
and the  
<sup>2</sup> R  
<sup>3</sup> It  
son and  
two sce  
tion be  
such as  
meant.

cross of Muiredach at Monasterboice, and those of Kells and Moone, as well as that at Iona. It appears also on Norman fonts at Cotham and Cowlam, in Yorkshire, and at East Meon, in Hants. The Expulsion from Eden and the Curse of Labour are also represented in the very curious bas-reliefs built into the early Norman west front of Lincoln Cathedral, which are certainly of earlier execution than the fabric itself. A series of three, or perhaps four, subjects from the history of Noah is also seen among the Lincoln bas-reliefs. (1) Noah, with aid of one of his sons, is engaged in building the Ark; (2) he and his family are seated in the Ark, their hands raised in prayer, the animals climbing up from below; (3) the 'eight souls saved through the water' come out of the Ark. This is succeeded by a group of the nimbed Deity conferring with a human being, possibly representing God's covenant with Noah.<sup>1</sup> Noah's Ark is represented in the rudest style on the cross at Kells. Four heads look out of the portholes; that of Noah himself is seen above the bow, the dove perching close by, his feet strangely appearing below the keel. The Sacrifice of Isaac, 'always a favourite subject throughout the whole range of Christian art,' appears on the cross of St. Patrick and St. Columba at Kells, and another on the great cross at Monasterboice, and on that of Moone Abbey, and in several other instances. 'The scene is treated in the most conventional way, the chief peculiarity being the attitude. Isaac bends over the altar like a man on a block, preparing to be beheaded.'<sup>2</sup> On three of these Irish crosses Isaac is engaged chopping wood for the fire of sacrifice in which he is to be consumed. The same scene is carved on the tympanum of a doorway at Rochester Cathedral. The rending of the lion by David or by Samson,<sup>3</sup> a scene which is not found in the catacomb or sarcophagus series, is seen on crosses at

<sup>1</sup> There is a subject from the same history which often escapes notice, being within the side-chapel added in the thirteenth century. The heads of three drowning beings appear above the waters of the Deluge, vainly catching at as many trees. The prow of a vessel, probably the Ark, and another drowning figure in the corner of an adjoining slab, the greater part hidden by the vaulting, indicates another scene. But it is evident that we are now approaching the debatable land between the symbolical and the historical.

<sup>2</sup> *Rhind Lectures*, p. 210.

<sup>3</sup> It is rather singular that in the 'Byzantine Guide' the scene of Samson and the lion is alone mentioned, that of David being omitted. The two scenes are hard to distinguish, the conventional mode of representation being the same. But on the Celtic stones unmistakable accessories, such as a sheep, or a harp, or a shepherd's crook, show that David is meant. *Rhind Lectures*, p. 203.

Kells, Kilcullen, and Durrow, and on two Scotch stones.<sup>1</sup> The Three Children in the Furnace are represented at Monasterboice and at Moone Abbey, and Daniel in the Lions' Den at Moone, Kells, and Meigle in Perthshire, and in several other places in both countries.<sup>2</sup> The Three Children almost certainly form the subject of the carving at the left-hand lower corner of the very remarkable sculptured slab at Wirksworth, Derbyshire. The three figures wear peaked head-dresses, and stand in a kind of furnace made of iron bars. Daniel also forms one of the Lincoln Cathedral series, where he is surrounded by five lions, or creatures intended to do duty as such. The number of lions specified in the curiously minute directions of the 'Byzantine Guide to Painting,' already referred to, is seven, as given in the apocryphal addition to the book of Daniel,<sup>3</sup> with which the Moone Abbey cross corresponds; but 'as a general rule symmetry is preferred to historical accuracy, two or four being the most common number of lions.'<sup>4</sup>

The same correspondence is seen in the New Testament cycle. The Adoration of the Magi is not a common subject on Celtic stones, but it is found on the cross at Monasterboice, where Wise Men appear bare-headed instead of wearing the Phrygian bonnet usual in the Roman examples, which is also the usual head-dress of the Three Children. The same scene is carved on the font at Sculthorpe, in Norfolk, and at Cowlam, in Yorkshire. In the latter example the tradition of those eastern visitors to the Holy Child having been kings is partially observed. Two of the figures are crowned, while the third wears a conical head-dress, perhaps intended to stand for the Phrygian bonnet. The baptism of Christ is carved on a broken cross-shaft at Kells. Two streams, flowing from separate heads, the Jor and the Dan, unite to form one Jordan,<sup>5</sup> in which our Lord stands unclothed. The Baptist

<sup>1</sup> See Stuart, *Sculptured Stones of Scotland*, vol. i. pts. 61, 130.

<sup>2</sup> *Rhind Lectures*, pp. 218-20.

<sup>3</sup> *Bel and the Dragon*, vv. 30, 31 : οἱ δὲ ἔβαλον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν λάκκον τῶν λέοντων . . . ἦσαν δὲ ἐν τῷ λάκκῳ ἐπὶ λέοντες. The passage of the 'Manual' describing how the scene should be depicted is as follows: 'Daniel in the midst of a dark pit; his hands and eyes raised to heaven; he is surrounded by seven lions; above him the archangel Michael holding the prophet Habakkuk by the hair. The prophet carries a basket filled with bread and viands, which he presents to Daniel' (Didron, ii. 286).

<sup>4</sup> *Rhind Lectures*, p. 219.

<sup>5</sup> M. Didron, in an interesting note to the 'Byzantine Guide to Painting' (Didron, *Iconogr.* ii. 302), remarks that 'the name Jordan has been divided into two syllables (Jor-Danus), and the baptism is represented as taking place at the meeting of two waters, the Jor and the Danus, being

pou  
des  
The  
nat  
era.  
insc  
the  
acco  
the  
Bap  
each  
is q  
like  
sent  
Cath  
versa  
Laza  
nich  
work  
Nort  
on t  
pose  
the  
figur  
this  
recep  
out h  
numb  
Isle  
Lanc  
says

shown  
water  
to be p  
behind  
Ps. lxx  
as a p  
person  
reeds,  
the mo  
on sar  
<sup>1</sup> K  
<sup>2</sup> J  
fashion  
St. Nic  
shire;  
arch at

s.<sup>1</sup> The  
Monas-  
as' Den  
several  
almost  
d lower  
sworth,  
ses, and  
iel also  
is sur-  
duty as  
minute  
eady re-  
n to the  
oss cor-  
ferred to  
common  
stament  
subject  
terboice,  
ring the  
h is also  
scene is  
Cowlam,  
of those  
s is par-  
while the  
to stand  
arved on  
ng from  
orm one  
Baptist

130.

λάκκον τῶν  
age of the  
as follows:  
to heaven;  
el Michael  
es a basket  
ron, ii. 286).

le to Paint-  
n has been  
represented as  
anus, being

pours water on his head from a ladle. The Holy Spirit descends in the form of what may be presumed to be a dove.<sup>1</sup> Though not common on Celtic stones our Lord's baptism naturally finds a very frequent place on fonts of the Norman era. The most remarkable example is that on the rune-inscribed font at Bridekirk, in Cumberland. Our Lord, with the cruciferous nimbus, stands waist-deep in the water, which, according to the usual conventional fashion, in defiance of the laws of gravity, rises up in a heap round His body. The Baptist wears his camel-hair clothing, and places a hand on each of our Lord's shoulders. The symbol of the Holy Spirit is quite out of proportion to the other figures, and is more like a swan than a dove.<sup>2</sup> The raising of Lazarus is represented on the font at Lenton and on a slab at Chichester Cathedral. In these we notice a departure from the type universal in the Roman examples—in which the dead body of Lazarus stands erect, swathed like a mummy, in a kind of niche, our Lord standing by and touching it with his wonder-working rod—and the representation accords more with the Northern mode of burial. A somewhat perplexing carving on the very remarkable sculptured slab at Wirksworth, supposed by some to depict the Holy Babe in the manger and the visit of the shepherds (reduced, however, to a single figure), is probably a very rude *replica* of the earlier type of this miracle. The swathed figure lies recumbent in a hollow receptacle, like a stone coffin, to which a male figure stretches out his hand. The Eucharist appears to be symbolized on a number of pre-Norman sculptured stones in Scotland and the Isle of Man, and in one place at least in England, Halton, Lancashire. On these stones, of which Mr. Romilly Allen says 'no satisfactory explanation has been given,' two figures

shown as two human figures each holding an urn from which they pour water into one bed.' According to the rules of the 'Guide' the river was to be personified as a naked man pouring water out of a vase, looking behind him at Christ, as if in terror, with reference to the words of Ps. lxxvii. 16, 'The waters saw Thee, and were afraid,' &c. &c., regarded as a prophecy of the baptism of Christ. In Western art the Jordan is personified as a river god of pagan type, with a crown and sceptre of reeds, holding an urn from which water issues. It is thus symbolized in the mosaics of the Baptistery and S. Maria in Cosmedin at Ravenna, and on sarcophagi. See Bottari, tav. xxxix.

<sup>1</sup> *Rhind Lectures*, p. 231.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 288. The scene is represented in the same conventional fashion, with varied details, on the fonts of Wansford, Northants; St. Nicholas, Brighton; Castle Froome, Herefordshire; Kirkburn, Yorkshire; and Lenton, Notts; and on the capital of a column of the chancel arch at Adel, Yorkshire.

are seen, sometimes seated, sometimes standing, usually in ecclesiastical habit, sometimes holding books, between whom a round disk is being brought down in the mouth of a bird. Sometimes there is only a single human figure, and there are four disks accompanied with two fishes. These last representations are certainly intended to recall the miracle of the loaves and fishes; and bearing in mind the close symbolical connexion between the miracle and the Eucharist, and the perfect similarity of the objects in the two classes of stones, we can have little doubt that the disks are intended to represent the Sacramental bread, made to become the food of the soul by the descent of the Holy Ghost with reference to our Lord's words in John vi. 63.

The Crucifixion, which, together with all scenes from the Passion, it is well known is entirely wanting in the catacomb paintings and on the sculptured sarcophagi,<sup>1</sup> appears on some of the Irish crosses, and on the early churchyard crosses of Cornwall. It is found also on Scotch and Welsh sculptured stones, and on some of the English crosses, as those of Sandbach, in Cheshire, and Gosforth, in Cumberland, and in other places in England. Sometimes, but rarely, it appears on the tympanum of Norman doorways, and on fonts of the same period. That at Lenton, Notts, already noticed, is a very remarkable example.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Romilly Allen traces in a very interesting manner the gradual development of the representations of the Crucifixion out of the simple cross, which was originally the only memorial of the Passion the Christian consciousness of the Early Church allowed. He describes the Crucifixion as 'the outcome of a combination of the Lamb of God and the Cross.'<sup>3</sup> On the sculptured sarcophagi at Rome and elsewhere of the fifth and sixth centuries the 'Agnus Dei' is depicted bearing the Chi-Rho monogram on its forehead, then carrying a cross on its shoulder, then placed on an altar with a cross behind it, and showing wounds with blood flowing from them, and lastly the Lamb is enclosed within a medallion forming the centre of a cross. The next step was to substitute the human figure of the Saviour for the symbolical Lamb. The change was ratified by the 82nd Canon of the Quinisext Council (or 'in

<sup>1</sup> The Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem, the Apprehension of our Lord, the Denial of Peter, and Pilate washing his hands, are the only subjects from the closing scenes of the Gospel narrative found in the earlier cycle.

<sup>2</sup> The font at Coleshill, Warwickshire, the tympanum at Bolsover, Derbyshire, and slabs built into the wall at Romsey, Hants, and Daglingworth may be mentioned as examples.

<sup>3</sup> *Rhind Lectures*, p. 139.



Trullo), held at Constantinople in A.D. 692, which decreed that in future the form of Him who taketh away the sins of the world, the Lamb of God, our Lord, should be set up and depicted in human shape instead of the Lamb, formerly used.<sup>1</sup> On the very remarkable sculptured slab at Wirksworth, already more than once referred to, there is what appears to be a unique example of the Agnus Dei in the centre of a cross, surrounded by rude representations of the Evangelistic symbols. On the same slab is sculptured our Lord washing St. Peter's feet. He is standing in a tub, our Lord with the cruciform nimbus bending over him. Two other disciples stand behind. St. Peter in other examples, as that on a sarcophagus at Arles, is represented seated on a raised dais. The Wirksworth slab also bears the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, the burial of our Lord, and our Lord bearing His sceptre in an aureole carried by four winged angels.<sup>2</sup>

The Descent from the Cross is not found in early Christian art, but belongs to the later historical period, when the details of the Passion had begun to be morbidly dwelt on. In Norman sculptures there are examples on the font at North Grimston, in Yorkshire, and on one of the capitals of the chancel arch at Adel, near Leeds. What was known in mediæval language as the 'Harrowing of Hell'<sup>3</sup> ('Descensus Christi ad Inferos'), which often formed the subject of Mystery Plays, does not form an element of early symbolism. One of the best examples of it is in the sculptured door-head of

<sup>1</sup> Labbe, *Concilia*, vi. 1177 (ed. 1671). Adrian I. wrote to Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in 785, 'Ut igitur et in colorum effectibus omnium oculis subjiaciatur figura illa quæ Agnum illum qui abstulit peccata mundi, nimirum Deum nostrum, juxta humanam effigiem delineat: censemur ab hoc tempore pro veteri illo agno et novum in ecclesiis Dei erigendum, quo per eum exaltationem humilitatis Verbi Dei consideremus, quo in memoriam politiæ illius qua in carne vixit, item passionis ejus et salutiferæ mortis unde mundo liberatio contigit, veluti manu ducamur.'—Labbe, vii. col. 700. The lion, the human form, and the symbolical lamb were sometimes combined. Durandus lays down the rule, 'Non enim agnus Dei in cruce principaliter depingi debet; sed homine depicto non obest agnum in inferiori vel posteriori depingere' (*Rationale*, lib. i. c. 3, n. 6).

<sup>2</sup> This very remarkable slab is the only representative known to exist in Britain of the sculptured sarcophagi, crowded with figures, common in Rome and Italy and the South of France. It is slightly ridged, and has two series of groups; the Lamb on the cross forms the central subject of one, our Lord and glory of the other. As the heads of the figures all point the same way it is evident that it was placed against a wall to be looked at only from one side. The subjects have not as yet been all identified.

<sup>3</sup> 'Harrowing' is from the verb to 'harry,' also written 'harrow,' signifying to rob or spoil.

the little Norman church of Quenington, in Gloucestershire,<sup>1</sup> Christ with a cruciform nimbus tramples on the prostrate form of the evil one, whose clawed hands and feet are fettered, and with His right hand thrusts the butt end of the cross sceptre into the monster's open jaws, while with His left hand He draws out the naked forms of our first parents, their hands clasped in supplication.<sup>2</sup> The same subject is represented on one of the pre-Norman Lincoln bas-reliefs. There Hades is represented in the common conventional type as the mouth of a hideous monster, with huge teeth. The mouth stands open and our Lord walks into it, standing on the prostrate body of Satan, his limbs similarly manacled with interlaced ring-clasps, and takes out the 'spirits in prison,' stretching themselves forward to meet Him. There are examples of the same subject on a slab preserved in the inner Chapter room at Bristol Cathedral, and in tympanums at Beckford, in Gloucestershire, and at Shobdon, in Herefordshire. Perhaps the most interesting point in these sculptures is the fettering of the hands and feet of Satan, affording, as it does, a link between the sculptured crosses of Celtic times and Norman symbolism. Satan, or the Scandinavian Loki, occurs on several of the early cross-shafts, with his limbs manacled with interlaced rings. Examples occur at Gosforth, in Cumberland, Kirkby Stephen, Westmoreland, Kirk Andreas, in the Isle of Man, and elsewhere. Mr. Romilly Allen gives an illustrative quotation from the translation of a passage in *Cædmon* :—

'Heavy ring-clasps,  
A merciless manacle,  
Mock my weakness,  
Foil the struggles  
Of feet sore bounden,  
Hands tied helpless.'<sup>3</sup>

With this subject we must, for the present, close our examination of Christian symbolism. The sarcophagi have been hardly touched on, and the mosaics, a more fruitful

<sup>1</sup> *Rhind Lectures*, p. 278.

<sup>2</sup> Every detail of this sculpture corresponds with the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus, ccvi.—viii. (xxii.—iv.): παραδούς τὸν σατὰν τοῖς ἀγγέλοις εἶπε, 'συνήροίς δεσμεύσατε τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὸν τράχηλον καὶ στόμα αὐτοῦ,' κ.τ.λ.

<sup>3</sup> *Rhind Lectures*, pp. 278–81. Those who wish to pursue this curious subject will find materials in Professor Stephens's *Studies in Northern Mythology*; *Archæologia*, vol. xxiv.; *Archæological Journal*, vol. xxv. pp. 15–18, vol. xxx. p. 5, vol. xl. p. 143–56, and above all, when they are given to an expectant public, in Professor G. F. Browne's *Disney Lectures*.

source, have been passed over altogether. Enough has been said to indicate the surpassing interest of the subject, and we hope to encourage some of our readers to devote themselves earnestly to so fascinating a study, in which so much remains yet to be discovered.

---

ART. X.—CONDITION OF THE POOR AT THE  
EAST END OF LONDON.

1. *Labour and Life of the People*. Vol. I. East London. Edited by CHARLES BOOTH. (London, 1889.)
2. *Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes*. Vols. I. to III. (London, 1885.)
3. *First and Second Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the Sweating System*. (London, 1888.)

THIS century has witnessed a remarkable growth in the interest felt by the more educated and prosperous classes in the metropolis for their fellow citizens, less happily circumstanced, living in the eastern part of it. The change is no doubt largely owing to the revolution which has taken place in the employments and condition of the labouring people, and the amount of political power which has been entrusted to them. At the beginning of the century the population was about one-third of what it now is; England was much more of an agricultural than a manufacturing country, steam had only just begun to be applied to manufacturing purposes, and the whole condition of things much more resembled what it had been two or three centuries previously than what it now is, and there was little temptation to the people to migrate from the rural parts of the country to London. The system of apprenticeship was general; the employers of labour lived for the most part in the midst of those they employed; and the largest places of business in London were small by the side of what now commonly exist. In the first decade of the century the annual increase of the population of England and Wales was less than 130,000, and though that was at a rate five times greater than it had been a century earlier, it was little more than one-third of what it now is, and London did not grow at a much more rapid rate than the rest of England. Every decade saw the rate of increase accelerated both in England and in the metropolis, and in the year 1838, after

Dr. Blomfield had become Bishop of London, the eyes of churchmen began to open to a sense of the moral and spiritual waste there must be in many parts of the diocese owing to inadequate provision for the spiritual wants of the people. In that year a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the number of benefices in the kingdom, their population, income, and the number of clergymen who ministered in them. From this return we find that little or nothing had been done to furnish church accommodation and spiritual oversight for the multitudes of people who were thronging into London. Thus Bethnal Green had a population of 62,018, and there was one church and one chapel, served by two clergymen; Stepney had 51,200 people, with a similar provision of churches and clergymen; Whitechapel had 30,000 inhabitants; Shoreditch, 33,000; St. Luke's, Old Street, 46,642; Limehouse, 16,700; Hoxton, 24,000, each of these parishes having one church and one clergyman. Nor was the West End better cared for: St. George's, Hanover Square, had 58,209 people, and St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, 23,970, each with a church and chapel and two clergymen; for the 37,000 in the parish of St. James, Piccadilly, there were a church and two chapels, with three clergymen to minister in them; whilst in St. John's, Westminster, with 22,648 people, and St. Margaret's, Westminster, with 25,334, there was one church and one clergyman. It would be a still greater scandal if we were to mention how many of these benefices were held in plurality, and were served for a considerable part of the year by a curate, in the absence of the incumbent.

This inquiry was the precursor of extensive schemes for the religious and moral improvement of the people. The very strangeness of the idea that the wealthier people could care for the poorer folk at the other end of the metropolis seems to have raised a suspicion in the minds of these latter that there was something sinister in their advances, and that they ought to be resisted. We read in the life of Bishop Blomfield that 'when the first stone of the first new church (in Bethnal Green) was to be laid, the people, regarding the movement as an unwarrantable intrusion, assembled in crowds to jeer and scoff, and an infuriated bull was wantonly let loose to disturb the procession.'<sup>1</sup> It is, however, to the credit of the rising tide of spiritual energy in the Church that her children began to make efforts for the amelioration of the condition of people, who had been rapidly gathered at the other end of the metropolis, so soon as they realized what those wants were. But,

<sup>1</sup> *Bishop Blomfield's Life*, p. 184.

thous  
idea  
effect  
the s  
the m  
was r  
provi  
churc  
child  
parish  
for th  
not f  
for th  
know  
was a  
elsew  
part o  
as the  
were  
wants  
was r  
clergy  
forty  
many  
that p  
increa  
folk h  
which  
poore  
In  
of vie  
condit  
specia  
classe  
formin  
from  
then  
book  
issued  
self a  
these  
uttern  
person  
dition  
polis.

though this was done, there was little more than a general idea amongst religious people that something ought to be effected for the spiritual good of the neglected members of the same Church with themselves, but neither the rulers nor the members of the Church appear to have thought that more was needed than an increase in the amount of instruction provided for the people. Along with the effort to erect churches, provision began to be made for the education of children of the poorer classes in National Schools, and no parish was considered to be supplied with what was requisite for the moral and spiritual welfare of its people which was not furnished with a school. Notwithstanding these efforts for the good of the East End people, comparatively little was known about them by those who lived at the West End. It was assumed that there was the same mixture of classes as elsewhere, differing only in this, that 'the upper ten' in that part of London were not so well born or so highly educated as those living in more fashionable quarters, but that they were quite as well able to make provision for the ordinary wants of their poorer neighbours, and that nothing more was needed than to help them to obtain more churches and clergymen. That this was true to a much greater extent forty years since than it is now seems to be proved by the many excellent houses which are found on the main roads of that part of London, and by what we are told concerning the increasing poverty of the people living there, the wealthier folk having removed into more distant suburbs, and the houses which they used to inhabit being now let out in rooms to the poorest of the people.

In 1861 Mr. Henry Mayhew, from a philanthropic point of view, endeavoured to throw some light upon the material condition of the poorer classes of the metropolis. He was specially interested in 'the costermongers, and the various classes of people who gained their living by trading or performing in the streets. His plan of proceeding was to obtain from a number of these men a history of themselves, and then to publish their somewhat sensational stories in a book called *London Labour and the London Poor*, which was issued in twopenny numbers. He evidently regards himself as an explorer in an unknown region, and speaks of these people as less known than those who dwell in the uttermost parts of the earth. But whilst he gives numerous personal biographies, he fails to give a general idea of the condition of the people living in the poorer parts of the metropolis. With regard to those occupied in some trades, he

attempts to furnish more ample information, but this is done very partially, and he altogether fails to present us with sufficient facts to judge of the material, moral, or spiritual condition of the mass of the labouring people. Since then a flood of light has been thrown upon the subject. A Royal Commission has inquired into the manner in which the poor are housed, and a Committee of the House of Lords is investigating the condition of the toilers under the sweating system; one Committee of the House of Commons inquired into the influx of foreign Jews into the eastern part of London; whilst the whole question of Poor Relief has been laid open by another Committee. A Committee, having its head-quarters at the Mansion House, has thrown a good deal of light upon the sanitary defects of the East End, and another Committee meeting there collected large funds for the relief of the destitute poor a few winters since. Besides this, novelists have turned their attention to the subject, and have sometimes given harrowing pictures of the distress and misery to be found in that end of London, and endless appeals for various religious and philanthropic objects have naturally dwelt exclusively upon the sorrows and wretchedness which those who issued them were desirous to alleviate.

We have, therefore, had a number of fragmentary pictures of East End London and its inhabitants, but we have been sadly in want of a complete view in which these separate fragments might be combined; and we have been without a dispassionate statement of the whole question to which we could appeal as authoritative. This want has recently been supplied by Mr. Charles Booth, a gentleman connected, we believe, with the shipping trade in London and Liverpool, who bravely undertook to examine what was the real state of things with which the present generation is called upon to deal. Besides gaining information from every available quarter, of which we shall say more presently, he determined to qualify himself for the task by living amongst the people as one of themselves.

'For three separate periods,' he says, 'I have taken up quarters, each time for several weeks, where I was not known, and as a lodger have shared the lives of the people who would figure in my schedules as belonging to the classes who live upon intermittent earnings, or upon small regular earnings, both of these classes being reckoned among the poor whose average weekly earnings do not amount to a guinea a week, or else to the class immediately above them, where the earnings of the head of the family somewhat exceeded that amount. Being more or less boarded, as well as lodged, I became

intimate  
habits  
which  
question  
friends  
are not  
pleasant  
bodies,  
wives,  
—all the  
saw little  
higher  
least of

THE  
forma  
to as  
their  
open  
they  
statist  
Oxford  
intimate  
of the  
known  
a popu  
believing  
zation  
posse  
Throu  
bent  
no pr  
which  
nearly  
presen

W  
Shore  
East,  
with a  
of wo  
men (C  
people  
have s  
or fore  
live in



intimately acquainted with some of those I met, and the lives and habits of many others came naturally under observation. My object, which I trust was a fair one, was never suspected, my position never questioned. The people with whom I lived became and are still my friends. I may have been exceptionally fortunate, and three families are not many, but I can only speak as I have found : wholesome, pleasant, family life, very simple food, very regular habits, healthy bodies, and healthy minds ; affectionate relations of husbands and wives, mothers and sons, of elders with children, of friend with friend—all these things I found, and amongst those with whom I lodged I saw little to mar a very agreeable picture, fairly representative of the higher of the three classes named above, and applicable to some at least of the two lower.<sup>1</sup>

The authorities on which Mr. Booth chiefly relies for information are the School Board visitors, whose business it is to ascertain all that they can relative to the people in their respective districts, and whose books were freely laid open to him, accompanied with such additional particulars as they could give by word of mouth ; their statements and statistics were submitted to the residents in Toynbee Hall and Oxford House, and were examined carefully by many persons intimately acquainted, not with the whole, but with some part of the district to be examined, which consisted of what are known as the Tower Hamlets and Hackney, and contained a population of 900,000. The persons referred to were relieving officers, rent collectors, agents of the Charity Organization Society, employers of labour, and any others who possessed special information and were willing to impart it. Throughout it is well to bear in mind that Mr. Booth was bent upon simply obtaining accurate information, and had no preconceived religious, philanthropical, or political views which he desired to support. His endeavour was to give as nearly as he could a photographic picture of the facts, as they presented themselves to him.

We have, then, before us a district of London, including Shoreditch, Bethnal Green, Whitechapel, St. George's-in-the-East, Stepney, Mile End Old Town, Poplar, and Hackney, with a population of about 900,000, made up of various classes of working people, with a small percentage of professional men (chiefly clergymen and doctors) ; a certain number of people in fairly comfortable circumstances who keep shops or have small factories of their own, or are the responsible heads or foremen of extensive establishments of which the proprietors live in the suburbs ; and in Hackney a liberal sprinkling of

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 158.

persons in affluent circumstances. With the exception of the professional men and residents in Hackney, it may therefore be said that the district contains no highly-educated or cultured people, none who are able to elevate the tone of the less educated masses, or to have any direct influence upon their lives or habits of thought. With this important factor taken out of the constitution of society there is a grievous lack of something to bind it together. Leaders are wanted, but to make leaders there must be acknowledged superiority of station, ability, wealth, or some other form of influence placed sufficiently high for those around to see and admire it. The evil effects of this want are thus depicted :—

‘Apart from work, and away from the comfortless or crowded home, neither husband, wife, nor children have any alternative or relief except in the low level of monotonous excitement of the East-end street. Respectability and culture have fled ; the natural leaders of the working classes have deserted their post ; the lowest element sets the tone of East-end existence. Weary of work, and sick with the emptiness of stomach and mind, the man or the woman wanders into the street. The sensual laugh, the coarse joke, the brutal fight, or the mean and petty cheating of the street bargain are the outward sights yielded by society to soothe the inward condition of overstrain or hunger. Alas ! for the pitifulness of this ever-recurring drama of low life—this long chain of unknowing iniquity, children linked on to parents, friends to friends, ah, and lovers to lovers—bearing down to that bottomless pit of decaying life.’<sup>1</sup>

Under these circumstances it can be no matter for surprise that the Church, or other religious bodies, fail to exercise any general influence, though no doubt they attract to themselves a considerable number of earnest people and secure an amount of zeal and devotion from their members beyond what would ordinarily be found elsewhere. Much has been done to supply those deficiencies of religious services and pastoral care to which attention was called in the earlier part of this article, but much more must be done before the moral and spiritual condition of this part of London can be satisfactory. Instead of the one church, and one chapel, and two clergymen to minister in them provided for the 62,000 people in Bethnal Green, we have fifteen churches and thirty-three clergymen for the 130,000 now living within its borders. Instead of the one church, and one chapel, served by two clergymen to provide for the spiritual wants of the 51,200 people living in Stepney, we have twelve churches and one chapel, with thirty-four clergymen, to care for its 63,000 inhabitants. White-

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 201.

chapel  
to its  
clergy  
one ch  
was 3  
clergy  
increa  
more  
3,350.  
small  
it seem  
as all  
have  
But th  
difficu  
of the  
a neig  
little  
thus c

It  
mass c  
Compa  
mindes  
have b  
“If th

M  
of spin  
ence i  
The tr  
and th  
in nur  
seek t  
a sma  
of reli  
is don  
quite  
impre  
well c  
mitted  
Cante  
ing pe  
‘T  
in exist

chapel, that had but one church, and one clergyman to minister to its 30,000 people, has now five churches, served by thirteen clergymen to instruct its 63,000 people. Shoreditch had but one church, and one clergyman in 1838, though its population was 33,000; it has now fourteen churches, and thirty-three clergymen to minister to its 124,000 people. Great as this increase undoubtedly is, it still provides only one church for more than 8,000 people, and one clergyman for more than 3,350. With the people closely packed together and only a small proportion of them attending the services of the Church, it seems undesirable to provide more church accommodation, as all the people are within easy reach of a church, and could have the ministrations of a clergyman by asking for them. But the shifting character of the population makes it most difficult for the clergy to obtain influence over the great mass of them, so as to counteract the depressing tendency of such a neighbourhood, where in the general dead level there is so little to elevate, and so much to lower. Mr. Booth speaks thus of the religious tendencies of the people:—

It is difficult to say what part religion takes in the lives of the mass of them; it is not easy to define religion for this purpose. Comparatively few go to church, but they strike me as very earnest-minded and not without a religious feeling, even when they say, as I have heard a man say (thinking of the evils which surrounded him), "If there is a God, He must be a bad one."<sup>1</sup>

Moreover it has to be remembered that the long neglect of spiritual care for these masses of people has had an influence in the formation of habits which is not easily overcome. The tradition of neglect is handed down from father to son, and thus the sense of the duty of attending religious worship in numberless instances cannot be said to exist, and those who seek to inculcate it are too few in number to reach more than a small portion of the people, as there is no considerable class of religious or educated people to second their efforts. Much is done by earnest work and self-sacrifice, but that much is quite inadequate to supply the want or to make a serious impression on the surrounding apathy. The position is thus well described in a recently-issued Report of a joint Committee of the two Houses of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury on organizations to reach the masses of the working population:—

'They may refer to the painful and overwhelming evidence already in existence, to prove that exceptional efforts are required if the Church

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 119.

of England is to cope with the social, moral, and religious problems which have arisen in consequence of the neglect and torpor of past times, the abnormal rapidity of the growth of the population, and the vast aggregations of the people who are flocking in ever-increasing multitudes to towns in which the poorest and most densely-crowded districts are often centres of temptation and immorality.<sup>1</sup>

It is instructive to note the one special remedy on which this Committee insists, remembering that it included eight bishops and double that number of dignified clergymen, and that the Report is said to have been adopted unanimously by the Committee that presented it. Their recommendations are:—

‘(1) That the time has come when the Church can, with advantage, avail herself of the voluntary self-devotion of Brotherhoods, both clerical and lay, the members of which are willing to labour in the service of the Church without appealing for funds to any form of public support. (2) That the members of such Brotherhoods should be allowed to bind themselves by dispensable vows of celibacy, poverty, and obedience. (3) That such Brotherhoods should work in strict subordination to the authority of the Bishop of each Diocese in which they are established, and only on the invitation and under the sanction of the Parochial Clergy.’<sup>2</sup>

The following remarks of Mr. Booth seem to show that there is something to encourage such a proposal:—

‘The exercise in which the people most delight is discussion. Mile End waste on Saturday night, Victoria Park on Sunday, are where the meetings are mostly gathered. It may be that those who make up the crowds who surround the speakers, and who join in the wordy warfare, or split into groups of eager talkers, are the same individuals over and over again. But I do not think so. I believe keen dialectic to be the especial passion of the people at large. It is the fence, the cut and thrust, or skilful parry, that interests, rather than the merits of the subject, and it is religious discussion which interests the people most.’<sup>3</sup>

On the other hand, it is well to remember that there are more than a hundred agencies of a more or less religious and philanthropic character now at work in the district, and we fear it cannot be doubted that the results are disappointing, though many of them are deserving of all praise. It seems as though the people had a sense of the want of some definite religion to sustain them, but that they are ‘ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.’<sup>4</sup> This is illustrated by what Mr. Booth says concerning the Salvation Army:—

<sup>1</sup> Report, No. 241, p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Resolutions.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Tim. iii. 7.

ducti  
most  
pray,  
the gr  
who l  
but ta  
not th  
and al  
I do n  
one d

It wil  
peopl  
accep  
nomin  
indisp  
defini  
the tw  
posed  
rende  
religio  
mitted  
appea  
pathie  
cated  
souls  
now a  
most  
and fa  
places  
of the  
gotten  
have t

Th  
part o  
and s  
honou  
his ow  
which  
Oxford  
gably  
people  
improv  
&c.; v

'If the student of these matters turns his eyes from those conducting the service to those for whom it is conducted, he sees for the most part blank indifference. Some "may come to scoff and stay to pray," but scoffers are in truth more hopeful than those—and they are the great bulk of every audience of which I have ever made one—who look in "to see what is going on": enjoying the hymns perhaps, but taking the whole service as a diversion. I have said that I do not think the people of the East End of London irreligious in spirit, and also that doctrinal discussion is almost a passion with them; but I do not think the Salvation Army supplies what they want, in either one direction or the other.'

It will be seen from this that our religious divisions arouse the people's curiosity and are a real hindrance to their definitely accepting any teaching as true; whilst the so-called undenominational religious teaching given in board schools must indispose those educated in them to regard any positive definite doctrine as necessary for salvation; and so, between the two, obstacles against the reception of religion are interposed in the people's minds which must go far to thwart and render nugatory the earnest efforts of the clergy and other religious people. Such a plan as that proposed by the Committee of Convocation would have the priceless advantage of appealing directly to the imagination as well as to the sympathies of those in whose behalf they were labouring. Educated gentlemen would be seen to have forsaken all to win souls to Christ. No doubt this is true of many of the clergy now at work, but it is not obvious to the people, as for the most part they live in comfortable houses with their wives and families, and belong to a great spiritual body which has places of great dignity and profit at its disposal, to which any of the parochial clergy may be preferred; and so it is forgotten that many of them receive a very narrow income and have to pass most self-denying lives.

The philanthropic efforts which are being made in this part of London, side by side with the religious organizations, and sometimes independent of them, are deserving of all honour. Mr. F. N. Charrington has erected a beautiful hall at his own expense, in which there are frequent concerts, and in which he preaches to the people. At Toynbee Hall and Oxford House a number of University men labour indefatigably in different ways for the elevation of the labouring people; there are lectures on various subjects, classes for the improvement of those who wish for teaching, popular concerts, &c.; whilst at the People's Palace no pains are spared to

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 126.

furnish everything which can conduce to the intellectual or physical well-being of the people for whose benefit it has been erected at great cost.

Clubs abound at the East End; there are no fewer than 115 of them. Of these some decline to open their doors to strangers and are called proprietary clubs, and do not enjoy a good reputation, as it is generally supposed that betting and gambling are their main object. Mr. Booth includes thirty-two of these on his list. Beside these there are thirty-three philanthropic clubs in connexion with churches or missions, started, supported, and managed by outside influence; eighteen social clubs, and thirty-two political ones. The drink question furnishes the chief line of distinction between the philanthropic and social clubs, all but one of the former being conducted on temperance principles, whilst the latter largely depend on the profits from the sale of drink for their support:—

‘The difference between the social and political clubs is slight, lying mainly in the mode in which they are started. Social clubs in East London may or may not acquire a political tinge, but those intended to be political cannot stand unless social, and the social side tends to become more important than the political. There must be beer, but there is a good deal else. Almost every club has entertainments on Saturday and Monday, and a concert or discussion, lecture or some other attraction, once, or in some cases twice in the day, on Sunday; and billiards, bagatelle, and whist are greatly played. Whether from the publican or from the club, these are the things demanded by the people—beer, music, games, and discussion.’<sup>1</sup>

He further says:—

‘Judging by the clubs there would seem to be no doubt of the political complexion of East London, and the weekly papers mostly taken—*Reynolds's* and the *Dispatch*—tell the same story. But the tone is not so much Liberal, or even Radical, as Republican, outside of the lines, authorized or unauthorized, of English party politics, and thus very uncertain at the ballot box. There is also a good deal of vague, unorganized Socialism.’<sup>2</sup>

In such a district it is obvious that the influence of public houses must be considerable. It is clear from many passages in the book that Mr. Booth is fully alive to the evils of drunkenness and to the frightful misery which it entails upon those who are guilty of it; therefore when he speaks favourably of public houses he deserves every attention. In a very dispassionate spirit he says:—

‘Public houses play a larger part in the lives of the people than

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 99.

clubs  
put to  
altoget  
and o  
pictur  
miser  
some  
curse  
Anyo  
is ver

Whil  
who o  
with  
are th  
a clu  
spirit  
able,  
alive  
they  
deper  
a few  
or “s  
vided  
public  
charit  
succe  
becom  
of a c  
practi

‘In  
numbe  
decent  
disrepu  
with a  
day mo

An  
social  
manne  
is said  
learn  
Comm  
dation  
sunk s  
have r

<sup>1</sup> *La*



clubs or friendly societies, churches or missions, or perhaps than all put together, and bad it would be if their action and influence were altogether evil. This is not so, though the bad side is very palpable and continually enforced upon our minds. A most horrible and true picture may be drawn of the trade in drink and of the wickedness and misery that goes with it. So horrible that one cannot wonder that some eyes are blinded to all else, and there is a cry of Away with this cursed abomination. There is, however, much more to be said. Anyone who frequents a public house knows that actual drunkenness is very much the exception.<sup>1</sup>

Whilst there are some really vile houses in which most of those who stand at the bars, whether men or women, are stamped with the effects of drink, there are others, and happily these are the great majority, in which people meet and chat as in a club over their glass of beer more frequently than over spirits, and Mr. Booth asserts that 'the whole scene is comfortable, quiet, and orderly.' He says that publicans are quite alive to the necessities of the situation, and that on all sides they are seeking to add other strings to their bow and not to depend solely on the sale of drink. All now sell tobacco, not a few sell tea. 'Hot luncheons are offered, or a mid-day joint, or "sausages and mashed." Early coffee is frequently provided, and temperance drinks have a recognized place. 'The public houses also connect themselves with benefit clubs, charitable concerts, and "friendly draws." And, in order to succeed, each public house now finds itself compelled to become more of a music hall, more of a restaurant, or more of a club, or it must ally itself with thrift.'<sup>2</sup> And, as a practical conclusion, Mr. Booth adds:—

'In such a situation it would be a fatal mistake to decrease the number of the houses in the cause of temperance. To encourage the decent and respectable publican by making existence difficult to the disreputable is the better policy; but let us on no account interfere with a natural development which, if I am right, is making it every day more difficult to make a livelihood by the simple sale of drink.'<sup>3</sup>

Another point which has great influence on the moral and social condition of the people has not yet been noticed—the manner in which they are housed. On this subject nothing is said in the book from which we have been quoting, but we learn a good deal concerning it from reports of the Select Committee of the House of Lords. Bad as the accommodation is, it is perhaps a comfort to know that we have not sunk so low as some other countries, or possibly it is that we have risen a little whilst they have not done so. Dr. Adler,

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 115.

the Jewish Rabbi, told the Commission on the Sweating System that 'Some time ago a young Russian nobleman accompanied him on his visits to some of the worst tenements inhabited by the Jewish poor. He assured him that they were vastly superior to the hovels tenanted by the Moujik in his own country.'<sup>1</sup> But, however this may be, the following description by the Bishop of Bedford of the manner in which many are housed is most melancholy:—

'The poor people now are driven to occupy one room for the most part. There they have to live by day and sleep by night, there they have to work, and there is to be found all the trade refuse in the room, creating of course an immense danger, not only to themselves but to their neighbours. And yet the rents in East London are moderate when compared with other parts of the metropolis; for a three-roomed house there can be obtained for six shillings a week, which would only suffice for the rent of a single room near St. James's or Soho.'<sup>2</sup>

But though the rents are comparatively low at the East End, the change of habitation seems almost ceaseless with a certain portion of the community. 'There are districts in London where as many as a quarter of the inhabitants change their addresses in the course of a year,'<sup>3</sup> and we should add that no inconsiderable number of them change much more frequently than once in that time.

Before speaking of the manner in which this mass of labouring people gain their livelihood, it may be well to call attention to one or two matters which affect their position. We must try to realise that there is none of that local life and sentimental attachment to the place where they reside which is found in such rich abundance in some other parts of the country.

'Why is there so little local life and sentiment in East London? Why is it hardly possible to conceive an excited throng crying "Well played, Bethnal Green," with the same spirit which nerves the men of Bradford to crowd enthusiastically to the football field on a cold and drizzling November afternoon? There are many causes of the difference which will readily occur to all, but not the least of the reasons is one which clearly appears, if we look a little more closely at such vestiges of local activity as London can actually show. If we go to any co-operative meeting in the Tower Hamlets we may listen in vain for the accents of the cockney among the leaders of the working men. On the other hand, the broad dialect of Yorkshire or Lancashire seems to carry us back to the centres of English industry in the North, where the Trades Union and the Co-operative Society have all the strength and vitality which is painfully wanting

<sup>1</sup> First Report, p. 554.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 494.

<sup>3</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 504.

in th  
am  
stepm  
where  
Lanc

One  
feels  
inter  
good  
many

'T  
labou  
ing h  
the sr  
instan  
small  
saws,  
the in  
pit sav

Then

'T  
betwe  
accor  
countr  
less th

No fe  
polita

'T  
dustry  
They  
small  
time i  
End b  
to be c

'C  
drivers  
pany t  
countr

'P  
on in  
referen  
with th  
mecha  
true, h

in the East End. It is startling to find what a great proportion among the real leaders of London life regard London merely as a stepmother, and how many of the best of its inhabitants look elsewhere, to the Devonshire or Essex village, or to the Yorkshire or Lancashire town, for the centre of their attachment and their loyalty.<sup>1</sup>

One obvious effect of this is that the London-born workman feels that he is pushed to the wall, and that the immigrant interferes with his success in life. For this feeling there are good grounds. The higher wages paid in London attract many of the best workmen from the country. Then

'In the building trades employments are so affected by division of labour in London that an all-round man can only be made by learning his trade in the country. For example, joiners are "made" in the small towns, and they move towards the great centres. Another instance of attraction into the towns is afforded by the comparatively small trade of mill-sawyers. Formerly, before the days of machine saws, timber was sawn in the country districts where it grew. Now the industry is transferred to mills in large towns, whither the former pit sawyers of the country have followed their work.'<sup>2</sup>

Then

'There is a considerable migration of boot- and shoe-makers between London and the various provincial centres of the industry, according to the varying season of the trade in different parts of the country. Tailoring also is, to some extent, a migratory trade, though less than formerly.'

No fewer than 70 per cent. of the policemen in the Metropolitan and City forces have come from the country.

'The secretary of the Compositors' Union says that in this industry the country immigrants, as a rule, excel the native Londoner. They are steadier, and stick better to the organization. Only a small percentage of the members of the London Union served their time in London. Again, a great proportion of members of the East End branches of the Ironmoulders' Union are said by the secretary to be countrymen by birth.'<sup>3</sup>

'Countrymen also abound on the roads as carriers, omnibus drivers, &c. A man in the employ of the London Omnibus Company tells me that three-fourths of the staff came originally from the country.'<sup>4</sup>

'Perhaps the greatest piece of contract work now being carried on in East London is the erection of the Tower Bridge. With reference to the labour here employed the contractor supplies me with the following information. The greater proportion of the skilled mechanics come from the North. A large number of these, it is true, have been employed in different places under the same con-

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 501.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 517.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 540.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 541.

tractor and have followed him to London, being more or less permanently employed by him. But at the beginning of the work, the proportion of Londoners was considerably greater than at present. Many were taken on at first, but were soon found unprofitable workmen, or at least inferior to the Northerners. In the opinion of those who have the enterprise in hand this is universally the case; a man from London does not stick to his work so well as a man from Sheffield or the Tyne, and may be roughly said to be one-third less productive.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Booth, therefore, draws the conclusion that

'it is the result of the conditions of life in great towns, and especially in the greatest town of all, that muscular strength and energy get gradually used up; the second generation of Londoner is of lower physique and has less power of persistent work than the first, and the third generation (where it exists) is lower than the second.'<sup>2</sup>

So that,

'whatever loss to society may be implied by the drain of countrymen into London, it is no loss to London itself. It is a vivifying, not a death-bringing stream. We may cry "London for the English" if we will: he would be rash indeed who cried "London for the Londoner."'<sup>3</sup>

Whilst saying this Mr. Booth finds it most difficult to speak definitely concerning the places whence the immigrants come, or the reasons for their coming, or the trades to which they belong, beyond what is contained in the census returns. In 1881 not quite two-thirds of the people living in the metropolis (629 out of every 1,000) were born within its limits, whilst taking all England through nearly three out of every four (720 out of every 1,000) were born in the county in which they were residing; and in the seven largest Scotch towns (the only towns for which such statistics are published) the immigration is much greater than in London: not much more than one half of the residents (524 out of every 1,000) were natives of the town in which they were living. By a comparison of the births with the deaths we find that in the decade preceding 1881 there was an increase of 107,753 in the population beyond the natural growth, thus showing that upon the average London absorbed more than 10,000 people annually from other parts of the country. The extent to which this interferes with the labour question in the Metropolis it is impossible to state at all accurately, but, with the facts already mentioned, the growth is quite sufficient to make the London-born people feel themselves injured by the ceaseless importation of new hands.

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 542.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 553.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 554.

At  
of fore  
of popu  
a good  
the 'S  
great r  
Jews, w  
oppress

'The  
of the cl  
fatted  
revolting  
Robbed,  
people h  
not "bor  
capacity  
illicit de  
Christian  
ment the

The nur  
accurate  
it is cons  
resident  
between  
mated th  
living in  
End. It  
number t  
less imm  
with boar  
days; an  
London v  
little mor  
with Jew

'There  
small boat  
grants; bu  
looking th  
of the low  
viduals, us  
Hebrew pe  
push forwa  
offer bogus  
promise gu

At present no mention has been made of the large influx of foreigners, to whom a considerable portion of the increase of population is due, and about whom we have recently heard a good deal in the evidence given before the Commission on the 'Sweating System,' and on pauper immigration. The great majority of these immigrants are Polish or Russian Jews, who have been driven from their homes by violence and oppression.

'The central authorities of Russia, supported by the public opinion of the classes, on whom the Jewish money-lenders and traders have fattened, have deliberately encouraged mob violence of a brutal and revolting character as a costless but efficient means of expulsion. Robbed, outraged, in fear of death and physical torture, the chosen people have swarmed across the Russian frontier, bearing with them, not "borrowed jewels of silver, and jewels of gold and raiment," but a capacity for the silent evasion of the law, a faculty for secretive and illicit dealing, and mingled feelings of contempt and fear for the Christians amongst whom they have dwelt, and under whose government they have lived for successive generations.'<sup>1</sup>

The number of such immigrants into London cannot be accurately ascertained, but we have these facts to show that it is considerable. In 1760 the whole of the Jewish people resident in England numbered only 8,000 souls;<sup>2</sup> it is now between 60,000 and 70,000<sup>3</sup> in London, of whom it is estimated that 30,000 were actually born abroad. Of the Jews living in London the great majority are found at the East End. It will give some idea of the annual addition to their number to state that last year (1888) there were 1,322<sup>4</sup> homeless immigrants relieved at 'a Poor Jews' Temporary Shelter' with board and lodging for a period of from one to fourteen days; and of course many must arrive having friends in London who will help them for a while, and others with some little money of their own. The arrival of a Hamburg boat with Jewish passengers is thus described:—

'There are a few relations and friends awaiting the arrival of the small boats conveying passengers from the steamer filled with immigrants; but the crowd gathered in and about the gin-shop overlooking the narrow entrance of the landing stage are dock loungers of the lowest type and professional "runners." These latter individuals, usually of the Hebrew race, are among the most repulsive of Hebrew parasites; boat after boat touches the landing stage: they push forward, seize hold of the bundles or baskets of the new comers, offer bogus tickets to those who wish to travel forward to America, promise guidance and free lodging to those who hold in their hands

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 579.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 577.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 565.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 576.

addresses of acquaintances in Whitechapel, or who are absolutely friendless. A little man with an official badge (*Hebrew Ladies' Protective Society*) fights valiantly in their midst for the conduct of unprotected females, and shouts or whispers to the others to go to the Poor Jews' Temporary Shelter in Leman Street. For a few moments it is a scene of indescribable confusion: cries and counter cries; the hoarse laughter of the dock loungers at the strange garb and broken accent of the poverty-stricken foreigners; the rough swearing of the boatmen at passengers unable to pay the fee for landing. In another ten minutes eighty of the hundred new comers are dispersed in the back slums of Whitechapel; in another few days the majority of these, robbed of the little they possess, are turned out of the "free lodgings" destitute and friendless.<sup>1</sup>

The further description of these Polish and Russian immigrants is so graphic, and so ably sums up what is brought out in the evidence before the Committee of the House of Lords on the 'Sweating System,' that we feel we cannot do better than insert it.

'If we were able to follow the "greener" into the next scene of his adventures we should find him existing on the charity of a coreligionist, or toiling day and night for a small labour contractor in return for a shake-down, a cup of black coffee, and a hunch of brown bread. This state of dependence, however, does not last. For a time the man works as if he were a slave under the lash, silently, without complaint. But in a few months (in the busy season in a few weeks) the master enters his workshop and the man is not at his place. He has left without warning—silently—as he worked without pay. He has learnt his trade, and can sell his skill in the open market at the corner of Commercial Street; or possibly a neighbouring sweater, pressed with work, has offered him better terms. A year hence he has joined a chevras [a kind of Jewish guild], or has become an *habitué* of a gambling club; and unless he falls a victim to the Jewish passion for gambling, he employs the enforced leisure of the slack season in some form of petty dealing. He is soon in a fair way to become a tiny capitalist—a maker of profit as well as an earner of wage. He has moved out of the back court in which his fellow-countrymen are herded together like animals, and is comfortably installed in a model dwelling.'<sup>2</sup>

This is said to be a typical sketch; few of these foreign Jews bring with them any ready-made skill of a marketable character. They are assisted liberally by the Jewish Board of Guardians, more frequently with loans than with gifts, which for the most part they most honourably repay, but which give them a great advantage in competing with men who can only obtain the use of a small capital by paying usurious interest. Their character is thus summed up: These Jews

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, pp. 582-3.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 583.



'keep the peace, they pay their debts, and they abide by their contracts, practices in which they are undoubtedly superior to the English and Irish casual labourers among whom they dwell. For the Jew is quick to perceive that "law and order" and the "sanctity of contract" are the *sine quâ non* of a full and free competition in the open market. And it is by competition, and by competition alone, that the Jew seeks success. But in the case of the foreign Jews it is a competition unrestricted by the personal dignity of a definite standard of life, and unchecked by the social feelings of class loyalty and trade integrity. The small manufacturer injures the trade through which he rises to the rank of a capitalist by bad and dishonest production. The petty dealer or small money-lender, imbued with the economic precept of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market, suits his wares and his terms to the weakness, the ignorance, and the vice of his customers; the mechanic, indifferent to the interests of the class to which he temporarily belongs, and intent only on becoming a small master, acknowledges no limit to the process of underbidding fellow-workers, except the exhaustion of his own strength. In short the foreign Jew totally ignores all social obligations other than keeping the law of the land, the maintenance of his own family, and the charitable relief of co-religionists.'<sup>1</sup>

After such a description of the manner in which these immigrant Jews labour and succeed, it can be no matter for surprise that they are an object of intense hatred to native members of the labouring classes, whom they seek to undersell and drive out of their own markets. During the last few years they have been a very disturbing element in the labour market of the East End; and between them and the steady addition to the number of skilled artisans and others from the agricultural districts, the lot of the workers in the metropolis has been made much harder than it otherwise would have been.

Having thus dealt with the exceptional and disturbing elements in the labour market in the Tower Hamlets, it is desirable to attempt some account of the industries on which the great mass of the people depend for their daily bread, and for their ability to procure the comforts and conveniences of life. Substantially there is found the same division of classes and of the conditions under which men have to fight the battle for existence which is found in other large towns, the only difference being that London is so much larger than any other of our towns, and the division of classes inhabiting the different parts of it so much more complete, that we find the evils existing elsewhere in a somewhat exaggerated form.

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 589.

To begin with the lowest and most destitute class. Mr. Booth estimates that it numbers 11,000, and is made up of some occasional labourers, street sellers, loafers, criminals, and semi-criminals. He says that the estimate is only a rough one, as a very small proportion of these people have their names on the books of the School Board visitors, and only a small proportion of their children attend school, notwithstanding the stringent compulsory laws about education under which we live. Amongst these people there is little family life; they are the inmates of common lodging-houses and of the lowest class of courts and streets. Many of them are homeless outcasts, who sleep in the lodging-houses when they can raise 3*d.* for their bed, and who remain in the streets all night when they cannot. He says of them that

'their life is the life of savages, with vicissitudes of extreme hardship and occasional excess. Their food is of the coarsest description, and their only luxury is drink. It is not easy to say how they live; the living is picked up, and what is got is frequently shared. From them come the battered figures who slouch through the streets, and play the beggar or the bully, or help to foul the record of the unemployed. These are the worst class of corner men who hang round the doors of public houses, the young men who spring forward on any chance to earn a copper, the ready materials for disorder when occasion serves. They render no useful service, they create no wealth; more often they destroy it. They degrade whatever they touch, and as individuals are perhaps incapable of improvement. They may be to some extent a necessary evil in every large city, but their numbers will be affected by the economical condition of the classes above them and the discretion of the "charitable world"; their way of life, by the pressure of police supervision.'<sup>1</sup>

But whilst this lowest class is thus sketched, Mr. Booth cautions us against exaggerating their numbers and powers of evil:—

'The hordes of barbarians of whom we have heard, who, issuing from their slums, will one day overwhelm modern civilization, do not exist. There are barbarians, but they are a handful, a small and decreasing percentage: a disgrace, but not a danger.'<sup>2</sup>

Above this lowest class there are those who depend on casual earnings, who are very poor, and who are reckoned to number 100,000, including men, women, and children.

'It would seem that in almost every great centre of industry there are one or more "residual" employments which stand as buffers between ordinary productive industry and the poor-house. They are the refuge of the members of other industries who have failed,

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 38.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 39.

whether from their fault or their misfortune. Those who congregate in such employments often overstep the line which separates them as an industrial grade from the class of paupers, but can rarely rise again into the ranks of productive self-supporting, regular labour. Into the causes which continually recruit these residual employments it is unnecessary to enter here, but as a fact they seem always to exist. In the centres of the worsted industry the residual employment is offered by the combing-room and the dye-house. In East London it is offered by the Docks. It is surprising how quickly a man who is coming down in the world filters through all the grades of labour till he arrives at the bottom of all as a Dock casual. I have found among the casuals a son of a solicitor, and an ex-valet of a well-known peer, and have been told by Dock officials of the son of a general, a clergyman, and a baronet, who at various times picked up a living in this way. All types of men are represented in the crowd at the dock gate. There is a distinct class known to the gangers as "short time" men, who will not work before 11 or after 4. They are a leisured class, who now and then are very useful, but will on no account begin early or work late. By four o'clock they can earn at 5*d.* an hour all they want for the day, and no entreaty will keep them longer at work.<sup>1</sup>

Beside the men who thus work at the Docks there are included in this class a considerable number belonging to every trade, who, from mental, moral, and physical reasons, are incapable of good work, and if it were provided for them it is doubtful whether many of them could or would continue at it for any length of time. Most of those making up this class are 'from shiftlessness, helplessness, idleness, or drink,' inevitably poor.

The events of the last few weeks in August and the earlier ones of September may make a great change in the condition of the men just described; but how far it may prove for their permanent benefit remains to be seen. The great strike during that time was, of course, unforeseen by Mr. Booth; but what he says of the past and present condition of the lower class of labourers at the Docks suggests the idea that he felt things could not long continue as they were when he wrote. He says:—

'In 1872 the casuals of London and St. Katherine's, and of the West and East India Docks, had struck for and gained 5*d.* an hour, in exchange for 2*s.* 6*d.* a day. The Millwall, to defeat a combination among their men, had imported country labour. The masters were powerless to reduce wages; but they gave the usual alternative answer—more efficient management, labour-saving machinery, and piecework, meaning to the manual worker the same or even higher

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, pp. 531, 532.

wages, calculated by the hour, but fewer hands, harder worked, and more irregularly employed.<sup>1</sup>

Then at a later time :—

‘The London and St. Katherine’s Company has also introduced a mixed system of employing their casualty men. The casuals who work directly for the company are paid 5*d.* an hour ; but half the work of these docks is let out to small contractors, generally their own permanent or preference labourers. In 1880 the casuals struck against this system. They declared that they were being “sweated,” that the hunger for work induced men to accept starvation rates. The Company responded to their appeal. Now the ganger is bound to pay his hands a minimum of 6*d.* an hour. It is to be feared, however, that the struggle for work overleaps this restriction, and that a recognized form of sweating has been exchanged for an unrecognized and more demoralizing way of reducing wages—by the bribery and corruption necessary to secure employment.’<sup>2</sup>

These being the conditions of labour, we have next a view of the men seeking to obtain it :—

‘Now we believe, from our general inquiry, that there are ten thousand casual labourers, exclusive of waterside labourers, resident in the Tower Hamlets, employed principally at the Docks. The average of irregular hands employed by the three dock companies stands at three thousand ; that is, there is daily work at 3*s.* 6*d.* a day for three thousand men, supposing the business could be spread evenly throughout the year, and worked during regular hours.’<sup>3</sup>

Taking an average, there must therefore be seven thousand men seeking employment at the Docks, compelled to remain idle, and these belonging for the most part to that rank in society least able to take care of itself, undisciplined, and not infrequently reckless and vicious. The sight of such a body of men, apparently anxious to gain their livelihood by honest work, and not able to obtain it, must necessarily at all times have excited a large amount of pity and sympathy ; and it needed only leaders to make a demonstration of a most formidable character. These have been recently found, and a strike of gigantic dimensions has plunged the business part of London into a state of enforced idleness and alarm. Workers in all kinds of trades added to the confusion by striking, partly out of a desire to show sympathy with the dock labourers, and partly for the purpose of obtaining advantages for themselves. The demands of the men were an advance of wages from 5*d.* to 6*d.* an hour, and for overtime from 6*d.* to 8*d.* an hour ; that no employment should be given for less than four hours, and

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 186.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 193.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 197.

be paid for by less than 2s.; and that the system of work under contractors should be abolished. The two last points were speedily conceded by the Dock Companies, whilst the advance of wages was refused. To end the strike the ship-owners petitioned the Companies to be allowed to discharge their own vessels, the obvious intention being to concede the strikers' demand for advanced wages. The Dock Companies did not refuse the application, but requested that the consideration of it might be postponed until the strike was at an end, as the concession would require a revision of the dock dues payable to the Companies, inasmuch as a portion of their income is derived from the profits of unloading vessels, and the settlement of new rates under a partially altered system would need more consideration than could be given to it amid the excitement and anxieties of such a strike as that which was then in progress. A serious step towards ending the strike was then taken by a large number of the wharfingers separating themselves from the Dock Companies, and practically conceding the demands of the men; and as steamers bringing butter, fruit, and other perishable articles can be discharged at the wharves, this arrangement greatly reduced the number of strikers. A committee sitting at the Mansion House then intervened, and proposed that the Dock Companies should concede the advanced rate of pay after January 1 next, so that they would have time to make arrangements with the shipowners for such an increased charge as would recoup them for the loss they would sustain, whilst the men would be assured of obtaining all the advantages for which they had struck in a very short time. The proposal was made by the Lord Mayor, the Bishop of London, Cardinal Manning, Sir John Lubbock, and others, most, if not all, of whom had expressed their sympathy with the strikers. Upon their submitting it to Messrs. Burns and Tillett, as leaders of the men on strike, they understood that it was fully accepted by them, and that they would recommend its adoption to the strikers. Upon assurance being given to the dock committee that this was the case, they accepted the proposal, and for a time (September 7) it was fully hoped that there was once more peace, and that the strike was at an end. This hope was unfortunately dissipated on the next day, when the arrangement was repudiated by the men, and Messrs. Burns and Tillett denied that they had ever done more than promise that they would place it before the strikers for their consideration. In opposition to what was stated by gentlemen of the committee named above, they asserted that they had never made the promise on which the

negotiation had proceeded. And so the strike lingers on; the strikers encouraged by liberal remittances from Australia and elsewhere, but with diminished sympathy from philanthropists at home; the Dock Companies deeply annoyed by the reproaches unfairly heaped upon them, and by the manner in which their concessions to secure a settlement have been received, but still willing to lay aside personal feeling to bring an unhappy business to a close, and so prepared to adhere to their promise of advancing the rate of payment by the sum demanded at an early day. It has therefore come to this, that the date at which the advance of wages is to take effect is the only point remaining in dispute, and there is every reason to hope that this will have been satisfactorily arranged before this article is published. But it may be well to bear in mind that after this has been settled it is more than doubtful whether the strikers will gain the advantage which they expect, and to obtain which more than a quarter of a million of regular earnings must have been sacrificed. In all probability, the strike will lead to a complete change in the manner in which a portion of the work at the docks will be carried on, and the great receptacle for casual workers and men without characters will be to a considerable extent closed against them. We can only hope that the trade of the port of London will not have been seriously damaged. But on these points it is vain to prophesy, and all that can be done is to await the working out of a new problem. We must now revert to the book we had been examining.

There is a class which has hitherto been somewhat better off than that just described, but yet in some points resembling it, and numbering about 75,000. It is made up of poorer artisans, street sellers, small shopkeepers, who are more than most others the victims of competition, and upon whom fall most severely depressions of trade; beside these it includes men who work by the job, or who are in or out of work according to the season or the nature of their employment; stevedores and waterside porters can frequently secure only one or two days' work in a week, and there are some of these occupied with kindred employments, such as coal and grain porters and those who handle timber, from whom are required great physical strength, as well as aptitude and practice, who can earn when they are in full work high wages, but who have not full occupation; moreover, they suffer from exhaustion on account of the great exertion needed, and so are tempted to eat and drink to excess; consequently they often benefit comparatively little by the higher rate at which they are paid when

they h  
part i  
leadin  
pressu  
have t  
they h  
having  
ebb ti

' M  
if they  
of thes  
the mo  
people,  
improv  
perman  
ferentia

Most  
strike  
Their  
indust

AB  
work,  
these  
unders  
familie  
numbe  
regula  
branch

' O  
unless  
very po  
of sick  
drinks.  
ends m  
way an  
deman

It  
a num  
It will  
orderly  
a majo  
the do  
dock



they have employment. Men of this class are for the most part improvident; the uncertainty of their gains, instead of leading them to save what they can in good times against the pressure and want which they know must soon come, seems to have the contrary effect, and they will rashly expend all that they have in excess or riotous living, with the certainty of having to endure something bordering on starvation when the ebb tide of their trade sets in.

'Many of the men of this class could not keep a permanent job if they had it, and must break out from time to time; but the worst of these drop into one of the lower classes already described. For the most part I take this class to consist of hardworking, struggling people, not worse morally than any other class, though shiftless and improvident, but out of whom the most capable are either selected for permanent work, or equally lifted out of the section by obtaining preferential employment in irregular work.'<sup>1</sup>

Most of the men of this class have taken part in the recent strike with the view of obtaining advantages for themselves. Their wives and daughters are largely engaged in the various industries which require female labour.

Above this class Mr. Booth places those who have regular work, but whose earnings do not exceed a guinea a week. Of these the estimate is that there are 129,000, it always being understood that the figures given include the whole of the families of those who come under the classification. This number would be made up chiefly by men in gasworks, the regular hands in the Docks and warehouses, and some lower branches in factories, carmen, messengers, porters, &c.

'Of the whole section none can be said to rise above poverty, unless by the earnings of the children, nor are many to be classed as very poor. What they have comes in regularly, and, except in times of sickness in the family, actual want rarely presses unless the wife drinks. As a general rule these men have a hard struggle to make ends meet, but they are as a body decent, steady men, paying their way and bringing up their children respectably. The work they do demands little skill or intelligence.'<sup>2</sup>

It has yet to be seen whether the recent strike will elevate a number of the men of this lower class into a better position. It will probably do this for a certain number of the more orderly and industrious men, but at the expense of depriving a majority of the less dependable now casually employed at the docks of all chance of work. We may expect to find the dock labourers of the future more regularly employed and

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 48.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 49, 50.

at higher wages, whilst little or nothing will be left for the casuals.

It is here that Mr. Booth draws the dividing line between those whom he would designate as the poor, or persons in straitened circumstances, and those who can live in comparative comfort. The next, and most numerous of all the classes, are those regularly earning from 22s. to 30s. a week, and these he reckons to include 377,000 persons, or nearly one-half of the whole. This large body is made up of some servants in manufactories and breweries, the lower class of foremen, artisans, railway servants, policemen, seamen, and the more prosperous of the people who sell in the streets or keep small shops or coffee-houses, assistants in large shops and licensed houses, and so forth.

'This class is the recognized field of all forms of co-operation and combination; and I believe, and am glad to believe, that it holds its future in its own hands. No body of men deserves more consideration; it does not constitute a majority of the population in the East of London, nor probably in the whole of London, but perhaps it may do so taking England as a whole. It should be said that only in a very general way of speaking do these people form one class, and beneath this generality lie wide divergences of character, interests, and ways of life. This class owns a good deal of property in the aggregate.'<sup>1</sup>

Above these men we have what may be regarded as the highest class of labour, consisting of artisans in good employment, city warehousemen of the better class, the more responsible foremen, first-hand lightermen, earning from 30s. to 50s. a week, and requiring for the most part men not only of good character but of intelligence.

'These men,' Mr. Booth says, 'are the non-commissioned officers of the industrial army. The part they play in industry is peculiar. They have nothing to do with the planning or direction (properly so called) of business operations: their work is confined to superintendence. They supply no initiative, and having no responsibility of this kind they do not share in profits; but their services are very valuable, and their pay enables them to live reasonably comfortable lives, and provide adequately for old age. No large business could be conducted without such men as its pillars of support, and their loyalty and devotion to those whom they serve is very noteworthy. There is a great difference between these men and the artisans who may earn nearly as good wages; the foreman of ordinary labour generally sees things from the employer's point of view, while the skilled artisan sees them from the point of view of the employed. Connected with this fact it is to be observed that the foremen are a more contented set of men than the most prosperous artisans.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 53.

Th  
estima  
Ab  
small  
practic  
mated  
ordinar  
income  
facture  
of them

To  
the po  
numbe  
week, a  
that an  
to 30s.  
income  
those p  
class n  
stood t  
or inco  
long th  
laboure  
it is im  
dividing  
wholly  
fore. M  
or to en  
to be a  
docks v  
ployme  
those l  
where,  
do whe  
end.

It m  
ments i  
addition  
the doc  
hood, th  
ture, of  
in this t  
contract  
called.  
rather t

The number of persons included in this well-to-do class is estimated at 121,000 in the East End of London.

Above these in income and position are shopkeepers and small employers, clerks, &c., and professional men in small practice or holding subordinate positions; these are estimated to number about 34,000; and above them what are ordinarily described as the middle class; people with a fair income and engaged in various branches of trade and manufacture; these number about 45,000, and the larger portion of them live in Hackney.

To sum up the figures given by Mr. Booth. He divides the population into three great divisions; the very poor numbering 315,000 and earning not more than a guinea a week, and a large proportion of them very much less than that amount; those on the dividing line, who earn from 22s. to 30s. a week, who number about 377,000; and those whose income exceeds that sum by a comparatively small amount to those possessing affluence, the whole of this miscellaneous class numbering nearly 200,000; of course it must be understood that in all cases the numbers include not only the wage or income earners or possessors, but also their families. How long these figures may represent the financial condition of the labourers at the East End of London after the recent strike, it is impossible to say. The probability seems to be that the dividing line between the well-employed in all trades and the wholly unemployed, will be more sharply drawn than heretofore. If this compels the latter class to seek work elsewhere, or to emigrate in larger numbers than hitherto, it may prove to be a great good, as the recent condition of things at the docks was most unsatisfactory. It held out a chance of employment, which sufficed to keep up hope, and so hindered those buoyed up by it from turning their thoughts elsewhere, which it is to be expected they will be compelled to do when the chance of such employment is practically at an end.

It may be well to add something concerning other employments in which large numbers of the people are engaged, in addition to what has been already said incidentally. Beside the docks and the ordinary trades found in every neighbourhood, there are three chief industries, the manufacture of furniture, of boots and shoes, and of wearing apparel. They agree in this that a considerable portion of the work is done by subcontractors, or middlemen, or 'sweaters' as they are sometimes called. Men with a very small capital aim at being masters rather than men, and the horrors of their places of employ-

ment, especially in the boot-making trade, are vividly depicted in the evidence given before the 'Sweating Committee' of the House of Lords, but of this sufficient has already been said. The manufacture of wearing apparel has two independent branches, tailoring and making underclothing, chiefly for export. Some of this is done in small establishments, some by the workers at home; whilst there are larger establishments for all the trades just mentioned, and the universal testimony is that these are the best, whether regarded from the point of view of health, of consideration for the workers, or of the amount of money earned. The complaints of harsh treatment and miserably inadequate wages from workers in the other industries are much fewer than in the boot-making trade, possibly the reason may be that more skill to qualify men for the work is required. But during the recent strike men engaged in all industries seem to have taken part, and it may be hoped that the condition of many of them may be alleviated. But with respect to the small employers, who are evidently the chief offenders, it will be difficult to arrive at any settlement which can be counted upon as permanent. Their position is not such as to enable the opinion of society to exercise much influence over them, whilst their own poverty, and the necessities of those who seek to them for employment, will always be a temptation to grind down the wages they pay to the very lowest point, and we fear that this temptation will be stronger than most of them will be able to resist. It must be borne in mind that a large amount of the evil is attributed to there being more workers than there is work for them to do. This is markedly the case with the furniture makers, who are far more numerous than the wants of the trade justify, and consequently there is not infrequently considerable distress found amongst the less skilled hands. The protective tariffs now found in many of our colonies and in the United States have put a stop to the exportation of the cheaper kinds of goods, whilst the free importation of certain kinds of furniture from Austria and elsewhere has a tendency to diminish the demand for home-made articles. Moreover there has recently been developed a tendency to specialize employment; so that artisans, instead of being thoroughly trained to execute well the various branches of their trade, are confined to one portion of it; and as cheapness rather than excellence is found to be most in demand, the most mechanical ways for rapidly, and therefore cheaply, doing the work are resorted to. The consequence is that the number of thoroughly efficient skilled artisans decreases rather

than in  
found  
parts of  
large fa  
It v  
room  
living  
so bad  
by som  
from ci  
the sp  
relieve  
are in  
it is we  
in som  
be app  
doubt  
from m  
for whi  
nished  
labours  
exclusi  
conside  
of who  
been sa  
describ  
Thus h

'Th  
30s. a w  
young,  
think th  
nurses,  
They ar  
they are  
who wil  
of their  
parents  
the chil  
and whe  
to help  
numeros  
in the c  
really be  
may be  
I perhap  
improbab

than increases, and whilst there are still some such to be found at the East End, more would be discovered in other parts of London where for the most part they would work in large factories.

It will be seen from what has been said that there is ample room for improving the condition of the labouring classes living at the East End of London, though it is far from being so bad as it is sometimes described by sensational writers, or by some witnesses before Royal Commissions, or by those who from circumstances have to present in the most vivid colours the special wants and distresses which they are anxious to relieve or to lessen. Whilst ignoring the exaggerations, which are in danger of injuring the cause they are designed to help, it is well for us to realize that the condition of the people is in some respects bad enough to call for remedies which may be applied from without by others, whilst there can be no doubt that a much larger portion of the existing misery arises from moral faults, and from weak intellects or infirm health, for which society can provide no remedy beyond those furnished by the Church and the religious and philanthropic labours of pious people. But it is not right for us to dwell exclusively on this side of the situation, for that there is a considerable amount of social happiness amongst the people of whom we have been speaking, notwithstanding what has been said in another direction, Mr. Booth more than admits; he describes it in terms which may possibly surprise our readers. Thus he says:—

‘The children in that most numerous class, earning from 22s. to 30s. a week, and still more in the class just below them, have, when young, less chance of surviving than those of the rich, but I certainly think their lives are happier, free from the paraphernalia of servants, nurses, and governesses, always provided they have decent parents. They are more likely to suffer from spoiling than from harshness, for they are made much of, being commonly the pride of their mother, who will sacrifice much to see them prettily dressed, and the delight of their father’s heart. This makes the home and the happiness of the parents; but it is not this, it is the constant occupation which makes the children’s lives so happy. They have their regular school hours, and when at home, as soon as they are old enough, there is “Mother” to help, and they have numbers of little friends. In the more numerous class just named they have for playground the back yard, in the class below the even greater delights of the streets. With really bad parents the story would be different, but men and women may be very bad and yet love their children and make them happy. I perhaps build too much on my slight experience, but I see nothing improbable in the general view that the simple natural lives of work-

ing-class people tend to their own and their children's happiness, more than the artificial complicated existence of the rich.'<sup>1</sup>

When such remarks as these are possible, and when we remember what is said by the writers just referred to, it is obvious that there are two ways of looking at the subject, and that very different impressions will be produced from the side at which we look at the facts.

'It may with some show of reason be regarded as not so very bad that a tenth of the population should be reckoned as very poor, in a district so confessedly poverty-stricken as East London: but when we count up 100,000 individuals, the 20,000 families, who lead so pinched a life among the population described, and remember that there are in addition double that number who, if not actually pressed by want, yet have nothing to spare, we stand aghast from the picture. The divergence between these two points of view, between relative and absolute, is in itself enough to cause the whole difference between pessimism and optimism. To judge rightly we need to bear both in mind, never to forget the numbers when thinking of the percentages, nor the percentages when thinking of the numbers. This last is difficult to those whose daily experience or whose imagination brings vividly before them the trials and sorrows of individual lives. They refuse to set off and balance the happy hours of the same class, or even of the same people, against these miseries; much less can they consent to bring the lot of other classes into the account, add up the opposing figures, and contentedly carry forward a credit balance. In the arithmetic of woe they can only add or multiply, they cannot subtract or divide. In intensity of feeling such as this, and not in statistics, lies the power to move the world. But by statistics must this power be guided if it would move the world aright.'<sup>2</sup>

Before concluding, we must notice the disappointing part of the book. In collecting facts and statistics, in describing things as they are, and the condition of the people as it must be felt by themselves and not merely as it seems to philanthropists, who measure everything by their own standard, Mr. Booth's own contributions, and those of the friends whom he has called to his assistance, are excellent, and so far as our own experience goes we should say perfectly trustworthy. But when he comes to theorize about a remedy for the evils which he has witnessed, his proposals savour of the absolutely impracticable in a constitutional country; they might be possible in Russia, they are impossible in England. He says:—

'To effectually deal with the whole of the class depending upon casual earnings and very poor—for the State to nurse the helpless and incompetent as we in our own families nurse the helpless and incompetent and the sick, and provide for those who are not com-

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 160.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 598.

petent  
taking,  
to obta  
life.  
As it i  
another

And i

'P  
be allo  
land an  
and we  
to nigh  
account  
the lan  
That in  
material  
bable i  
much w  
by tryi  
tion w  
having  
out of  
gradual  
form of  
opening

To  
classes  
classes  
such a  
workh  
with w  
people  
lessly  
before  
as ther  
ready  
is to b  
found  
it then  
time ag  
the str  
to find  
provok  
Govern



petent to provide for themselves—may seem an impossible undertaking, but nothing less than this will enable self-respecting labour to obtain its full remuneration, and the nation its raised standard of life. The difficulties, which are certainly great, do not lie in the cost. As it is, these unfortunate people cost the community one way or another considerably more than they contribute.<sup>1</sup>

And it is thus that he would deal with them :—

‘ Put practically, but shortly, my idea is that these people should be allowed to live as families in industrial groups, planted wherever land and building materials were cheap, being well housed, well fed, and well warmed ; and taught, trained, and employed from morning to night on work, indoors or out, for themselves, or on Government account ; in the building of their own dwellings, in the cultivation of the land, in the making of clothes, or in the making of furniture. That in exchange for the work done the Government should supply materials and whatever else was needed. On this footing it is probable that the State would find the work done very dear, and by so much would lose. How much the loss would be could only be told by trying the system experimentally. There would be no competition with the outside world. It would be merely that the State, having these people on its hands, obtained whatever value it could out of their work. As I reject any form of compulsion, save the gradual pressure of a rising standard of life, so, too, I suggest no form of restraint beyond the natural difficulty of finding a fresh opening in an ever hardening world.’<sup>2</sup>

To those who have had much experience of the poorer classes, and especially of the incompetent portions of those classes, it will at once appear how hopelessly impracticable such a scheme would be. The discontent and misery in our workhouses is great, but is kept under by the strong hand with which their inhabitants are ruled : to place numbers of people of the same kind in a position where they could ceaselessly bring all their helpless misery and hopeless discontent before the world, would make control over them impossible, as there would always be demagogues in and out of Parliament ready to exaggerate their complaints. Then if their labour is to be turned to any practical account, some market must be found for what they produce, as they could not consume all of it themselves. Remembering the outcry made from time to time against the sale of articles manufactured by prisoners and the straits to which the prison authorities are sometimes reduced to find employment which shall interfere with no trade and provoke no serious remonstrances, we should despair of any Government finding occupation for the large class of persons

<sup>1</sup> *Labour and Life*, p. 165

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 167.

needing it under such a system as that proposed without arousing a storm of discontent. There are many other objections, not of a financial character, to such a scheme which will occur to our readers, but upon which we need not dwell.

That ameliorations to the present state of things are possible we do not doubt. Much might be done to improve the dwellings of the working classes; much might be done by an extension of the system of inspecting all places in which is carried on the manufacture of any kind of articles, by competent inspectors, and arming them with sufficient power to remove obvious abuses; but much more might be accomplished by implanting a higher sense of religious and moral obligation in the hearts of employers and employed. For our own part we believe that the only true and perfect remedy for the social, as well as the moral, evils of the world is to be found in the religion of the Gospel, in earnest religious men endeavouring to carry out its precepts in everyday life, and so acting as the salt of the earth by which the other portions may be saved from corruption. No doubt to secure improvement before men's hearts are penetrated by this higher principle, or even after they have been influenced by it, strong remedies would have to be applied, and some of these might not be altogether agreeable. When the population of a country increases beyond its power of furnishing them with sufficient food and with profitable employment, as it apparently has done in England, those not needed at home should be transplanted to other countries. But a wise system of colonization, planned and carried out by responsible people, need cause no more suffering than is now being constantly endured by numberless well-ordered families. Under such a system those for whom the land was too strait, and who found the conditions in which they were placed too onerous, should be willing to seek their fortunes in other parts of the world, whilst their more fortunate fellow-countrymen, who were left at home, should be ready to furnish them with what was needed to make a start elsewhere.

P.S.—The hopes and anticipations in which we ventured to indulge (p. 216) have, we rejoice to say, been realized. On the evening of Saturday, September 14, the strike came to an end, and on the following Monday the men returned to their work. For this toward result it is only fair to admit that the credit is largely due to the high position, force of character, personal influence, and indefatigable assiduity—his great age and 'many infirmities' notwithstanding—of Cardinal

Man  
than  
bear  
thwa  
stage  
of pic  
in th  
crown  
his be  
pacific

THE  
Gellib  
will cr  
will n  
defenc  
obloqu  
righted  
be tru  
Church  
might  
proof  
great c  
high ri  
structio  
ments  
much  
could  
was his  
which  
disappo  
gave to  
elemen  
gratitu  
cation  
allowed  
schools  
Church  
its disp  
of thos  
would  
whilst t  
and cau  
VOL.

Manning. He had the good sense, and, what is even better than good sense, the good feeling and the good temper, to bear with patient dignity the rebuff which, as we have seen, thwarted the Conciliation Committee at a somewhat earlier stage of the negotiations. He was not deterred by feelings of pique or wounded pride from renewing his Christian efforts in the cause of Peace, and in the success which ultimately crowned his perseverance he will have found, we cannot doubt, his best reward. 'Honour to whom honour is due.' *Beati pacifici.*

---

*In Memoriam.*

LORD ADDINGTON.

THE death of the first Lord Addington—better known as Mr. John Gellibrand Hubbard—which took place on Wednesday, September 4, will create a gap in the ranks of eminent lay Churchmen which it will not be easy to fill. Few men have been more consistent in defence of their principles, more resolute under a storm of undeserved obloquy and abuse, and more ready to step forward to champion a righteous cause. His life was a manifestation of what he believed to be true. Thoroughly believing in the catholicity of the English Church, he was always prepared to do what he could to further what might tend to make others partakers of his faith. The most striking proof of this was seen in the erection of St. Alban's, Holborn. At great cost he erected that beautiful church, and, whilst anxious for a high ritual and as ornate a service as would tend to the religious instruction of the people, he was scarcely prepared for all the developments which were exhibited there. But whilst not sympathizing with much that was done, he never set forth his disapproval in a way that could interfere with good work done by its clergy. Conspicuous as was his work at St. Alban's, and the patience and good temper with which he bore much that must have been a very severe trial and disappointment to him, it is doubtful whether the support which he gave to the cause of religious education and the increase of Church elementary schools does not constitute a still greater claim on the gratitude of Churchmen. After the passing of the Elementary Education Act of 1870, a period of grace till the end of the year was allowed for obtaining grants towards the erection of denominational schools; in consequence, applications for help towards erecting Church schools poured in upon the National Society. The funds at its disposal were quite unequal to making grants to the great majority of those applying. Timid counsels, coupled with refusals of help, would have damped the ardour of the promoters of the schools, whilst to actually promise help might land the Society in insolvency, and cause serious loss to parishes disappointed of receiving the help

VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVII.

Q

promised. At that emergency Mr. Hubbard nobly stood forward and encouraged the Society to a bold and generous course, significantly saying that 'he would take care no harm resulted.' Encouraged by such a wealthy and liberal friend, the Society promised assistance which led to a rapid multiplication of Church schools; in fact their number has doubled since 1870. These are conspicuous examples of what Mr. Hubbard did; but privately and continuously his wise counsels and liberal hand made themselves heard and felt in the furtherance of the Church's work. It is an open secret that when Radley was in financial difficulties, Mr. Hubbard hastened to the rescue by becoming its proprietor at the cost of some 30,000*l*. That he was eventually reimbursed does not, as it seems to us, detract in the slightest degree from the high-hearted initiative which at the time saved the institution from utter wreck.

Nor was the Church and Church Education the only scene of his useful activity. As a politician he was ever ready to uphold and defend the cause of good government and righteousness. Undeterred by the fear of opposition or unpopularity, he never shrank from publicly saying what ran counter to popular opinion, and pleading for what he was well aware might injure his prospect of success at the next election.

In the City, where an important part of his life was passed, his name stood high for unswerving integrity. As the head of an influential firm of Russia merchants; as a Director, and for a time Governor, of the Bank of England; as an important member of the Russia Company; and as Chairman for many years of the Lands' Improvement Company, he was well known in commercial and agricultural circles, and wherever he was known he was respected and esteemed. In figure he was a very striking personage. Tall and erect, his elastic gait, his bright eye, his honest look, his frank greeting, his friendly grasp—all combined to fasten his image on the eye, and to fix his memory in the heart.

In a notice in this Review it would ill become us not to state that he was one of a small company who undertook the responsibility of providing Churchmen with an organ in which the questions that more deeply interest them may be fully discussed.

At the close of his long and eventful life he was created Lord Addington, and of him it can truly be said that the honour he added to the roll of the Peerage exceeded that which he received.

The end of his life was a fitting termination to such a career. After years of active, painstaking labour in the cause of Christ and of His Church he quietly fell asleep, none knowing the exact moment at which his spirit took its peaceful flight.

He has left his work in the world, and his mark upon the Church of England, and we can only pray that God may raise up many others to do as he has done.

The  
I  
I  
C

It is  
the P  
tion.  
centur  
has e  
greate  
remen  
ject w  
imagin  
hopes

Th  
during  
Now i  
finding  
Holy  
amid  
Throu  
becam

Tw  
these s  
which  
strengt  
the not  
langua  
langua  
in the  
of the

But  
become  
often ca  
With D  
are the  
has an  
gained  
where,  
meet th  
injuring  
ing ser

'Is t  
beset at  
may be  
—who r

## SHORT NOTICES.

*The Incarnation as a Motive Power. Sermons.* By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Honorary Canon of Cumbrae. (London: Rivingtons, 1889.)

It is difficult to conceive a subject more suitable for the sermons of the Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Oxford than the Incarnation. The study of the Church History of the fourth and fifth centuries has been to him the labour of love and of a lifetime; he has edited many of its greatest writers, he has written a life of its greatest hero, while all who have been to his Oxford lectures will remember that better than all the learning which illustrated his subject was the richness of sympathy and the warmth of historical imagination which made him live in the past, and make his own its hopes and its struggles.

The present volume of sermons, preached, as the preface tells us, during the last fifteen years, all group round this central subject. Now it is Christmas and the preparation for it; now it is faith as finding its object in Christ; the Temptation, the Atonement, the Holy Eucharist; or it is Christ and social duty, Christ's presence amid theological studies, Christ's presence with His ministers. Through all alike there runs the one note, 'Christ, who being God became man.'

Two or three points have particularly struck us in reading through these sermons. The first is their theological accuracy, an accuracy which is never obtruded or pushed forward, but which underlies and strengthens the whole book. We may notice this in a formal way in the note on 'exinanition' at the end of the book, or in the careful language used regarding grace on p. 45, or in the cautious but firm language used regarding the doctrine of an 'arbitrary substitution' in the Atonement on p. 84, or in the treatment in the Eighth Sermon of the very difficult subject of the Temptation.

But theological accuracy is too often theological barrenness; it becomes associated in our minds with that dry dogmatism which has often caused Christian doctrines to be attacked as unreal or scholastic. With Dr. Bright the doctrines which he has studied and preached are the motive powers of his life and the inspiration of his actions. He has an acquaintance with the needs of human nature which may be gained by anyone of thoughtful mind in his study as well as elsewhere, and he shows how the truths he is commissioned to deliver meet these needs. He himself feels the danger of theological studies injuring spiritual life, and expresses it in one of the most interesting sermons, that on Christ's Presence amid Theological Studies.

'Is there not a form of temptation,' he says, 'of hindrance, which will beset at least some persons thus occupied [*i.e.* in theological studies], who may be wholly, or almost wholly, free from temptations to heresy or unbelief—who may, in fact, be keenly alive to the richness, fulness, strength,

sweetness, majesty, and harmony of Christianity as taught and believed within the Church? A person may be so absorbed in the intellectual consideration of these truths as to seek them, if one may so say, for themselves, and to forget that if they are anything at all they are witnesses for a living presence . . . while he goes on thinking, reading, working, he may forget his own personal relations to the Saviour' (p. 225).

This principle of the reality of doctrine, of its bearing on human life, runs through every sermon, and takes away every touch of academicism.

So much of the spirit which inspired Athanasius Dr. Bright has caught; he has also learnt something of that great power which in him was almost an inspiration, the power of preserving the balance of theological truths. Guided by this, men will be

'keenly sensitive as to false antitheses, however clean-cut and epigrammatic, between faith and reason, doctrine and life, Scripture and the Church, spirit and form, the outward and the inward, corporate authority and individual responsibility. They will recognize the reality of "prevenient" or origination grace, and of the response which is made, under its influence, by the will; will see that sacramental ordinances are not a barrier between God and the soul, but an appointed organ of Divine communications, in which the "efficient cause" is the Holy Spirit; will find the Eucharist, especially, accounted for by the Incarnation, and the Incarnation brought home and appropriated in the Eucharist; will understand that the baptismal infusion of spiritual life involves the necessity of its subsequent expansion or reinforcement; will admit that a ministerial priesthood is intelligible as the representation and expression of the High-priesthood of Christ on the one hand, and of the priesthood of Christians on the other' (Preface, pp. viii, ix).

These are weighty words, and are an extract from a preface which many of every school in the present day might well ponder over with thoughtfulness and care.

*Christmastide in St. Paul's. Sermons bearing chiefly on the birth of Our Lord and the end of the year.* By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. (London: Rivingtons, 1889.)

WE must begin by expressing our gratitude to Dr. Liddon for continuing the publication of the sermons which he has preached during the last twenty years at St. Paul's. We would gladly, if we had space at our disposal, devote much time to analysing their merits; we feel, and our readers will feel, that to indulge in commonplace words of praise would be alike unbecoming and unnecessary. It will be sufficient for us to notify the fact of their appearance; they will be bought without our commendation, and would be bought in spite of any condemnation they might receive.

In reading through this volume we have had more and more brought home to us what we cannot but feel is a very reassuring fact. We are reading the sermons of not only the greatest but also the most popular preacher of the Anglican Church; and yet we are struck by the absence of any attempt to be popular, and by the

severer  
exhibi  
his co  
critici  
he doe  
argum  
preser  
contra  
we feel  
have c  
feeling  
phrase  
are mo  
for bei  
level, t

Tw  
in refer  
able en

'At  
And wi  
left in  
feel the  
inconve  
or that  
society,  
are uns  
morsel  
of fearl  
and to

But  
time.  
relation  
empire,  
fulfilled  
Gradua  
the bea  
dream.  
May we  
words b

'The  
of the  
Jerusalem  
reproach  
aspiration  
is for yo  
generati  
a succes  
by your  
taken in  
of its g  
English



severity of literary form, and by the self-restraint which is everywhere exhibited. So confident is the preacher of his power of interesting his congregation that he does not dread to enter on a point of textual criticism, he does not fear to be minute in his exegesis of an obscurity, he does not hurry over what some might call the dull portion of an argument, his one care is to guard against misinterpretation, and to preserve the balance of solid theological accuracy. We cannot help contrasting him in thought with some more rhetorical preachers, and we feel that it is just because there is matter in his sermons that people have come away year after year without being disappointed, without feeling that they have wasted a pleasant hour in listening to smooth phrases. It should be a lesson to preachers that their congregations are more thoughtful and more intelligent than they are given credit for being. More men insult their hearers by preaching below their level, than puzzle them by rising above it.

Two special points we must notice. Are not these words, written in reference to the strike of the London gas-stokers in 1872, applicable enough at the present day?—

‘At home the relations of labour and capital are as unsettled as ever. And when it was doubtful, three weeks since, whether London would be left in darkness at night, the most unreflecting must have been led to feel the pressure of the great questions which lay behind the temporary inconvenience. Do not let us suppose that the fault is all on one side, or that great dangers in the future, threatening the very structure of society, will be avoided unless those who have property and privileges are unselfish enough to consider the case of others who work for every morsel that they eat; unless the energy of a wise charity and of a spirit of fearless justice can keep pace with the determination to impose order and to uphold the supremacy of law’ (p. 316).

But it is the last sermon which has most interest at the present time. When Dr. Liddon, preaching in 1871, sketched the ideal relation of the great cathedral of St. Paul’s to the metropolis and the empire, he hardly realized how much that he hoped for might be fulfilled. Slowly and quietly the work of reform has been going on. Gradually the great cathedral and its capacities have been developed; the beauty of its services and its hold on the people are now no idle dream. And already the work of its adornment has been begun. May we hope that it will not cease? To each generation may the words be repeated with which the sermon and the volume closes:—

‘The great church remains an image in the realm of sense and time of the eternal realities, as were the hills which stood round about Jerusalem. It remains with its outline of matchless beauty, with its reproachful poverty of detail, appealed to, yet condemned by the religious aspirations, while face to face with the boundless wealth of London. It is for you to say whether this shall be so hereafter; whether one more generation shall be permitted to pass away, leaving St. Paul’s as it is to a successor. It is for you to decide whether by your present efforts, and by your persevering interests, a most important step is or is not to be taken in our day towards making this church worthy, to some extent, of its great position, as the heart of the metropolis of England and of English Christendom’ (p. 426).

*Patient Waiting. Sermons preached in Canterbury Cathedral.* By BENJAMIN HARRISON, late Archdeacon of Maidstone. (London : Rivingtons, 1889.)

THESE sermons will prove a pleasing memorial of one who laboured long and well for the Church. They are aptly described in the preface. We seem to know beforehand that we shall find in the teaching nothing in the way 'of art and man's device,' but only the 'words of truth and soberness.' They are mostly on the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the first contains a defence of its Pauline authorship. There is a short Memoir at the beginning which we wish had been longer. But the most interesting portion of the volume is the reprint of a charge delivered in 1848, containing a Memoir of Archbishop Howley, and entitled 'The Remembrance of a Departed Guide and Ruler in the Church of God.' Both the Archbishop and his Archdeacon were typical Christian gentlemen; no one was better entitled to write this memoir, and no one could have written it more sympathetically. There seems something strange in reading words like the following at the present day :—'He was eminently a fostering father to the Colonial Church, whose extension his Grace most ably and zealously laboured to promote, and, by the blessing of the Divine Head of the Church, with remarkable success, having found *five* Colonial bishops when he was promoted to the see of Canterbury, and having left *twenty-two* at his Grace's lamented death' (p. 226).

*The First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians, with Notes critical and practical.* By the Rev. M. F. SADLER. (London : George Bell and Sons, 1889.)

*The Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians.* By the Rev. M. F. SADLER. (London : George Bell and Sons, 1889.)

WE heartily welcome two new volumes of the Vicar of Honiton's well-known Commentary. But while congratulating him on the advance which he makes in his enterprise, we must entreat him not to allow himself to hurry on too fast. It is true that as he advances he will find much that he has already considered; it is true also that he must have a natural desire to comment, if his life is prolonged, on the whole of the New Testament; but it is also true that it will be much better if he only does some well than if he does all less well. The standard of his earlier volumes is so high that we should feel it nothing short of a disaster if he should decline from it. Of second-rate commentaries there is no lack; the good ones are few indeed.

The most important of the five Epistles which are commented on in these volumes is the First to the Corinthians. In the introduction (p. vi) he insists on the dominant truth conveyed by this Epistle, 'that Christ is the head of a mystical Body, the Church, and that this Church is so the Body of Christ, that each member of the Church is a member of Christ, spiritually and sacramentally united to Him in one Divine organism.' Now this is perfectly true, but we wish that

Mr. S. defines questions. Corin the E thians remind anything

THE no Epistl broug this p with s

TH ductio to tak readin thoug the ge clergy comm some dabbli heard, positio Church as it m section such a stance of Cor

W is the these making

A Pla

so J.

We do The au he com preach neglect circum illustra empha not, ho fancifu

Mr. Sadler had emphasized more fully that this doctrine is not definitely stated, but assumed. St. Paul deals with a number of questions which come before him in the light of this truth, which the Corinthians must have already learnt ; the teaching of the Epistle to the Ephesians is not only contained in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, but is looked upon as something already known. St. Paul reminds his hearers of what they had heard, he does not teach them anything new.

The commentaries throughout on the Eucharistic passages, and the note at the end on Apostolical traditions are admirable. The Epistles of St. Paul are full of a deeper meaning to anyone who is brought up in the Church's doctrinal system ; we may compare on this point Mr. Sadler's commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians with such well-known lectures as those of Dr. Dale.

The weakest points in these volumes seem to us to be the Introductions. We are not altogether sorry for this, as it is quite possible to take too much interest in reading *about* a book, and too little in reading its contents. Still, we cannot help feeling that a more thoughtful treatment ought to be given to questions such as that of the genuineness of the Epistle to the Ephesians. An inexperienced clergyman who has not the time or the opportunity of consulting larger commentaries may find himself confronted by arguments produced by some of that new class of dissenters who support their views by dabbling in German speculation—arguments of which he has never heard, and which he wants assistance in answering. The German position is not, after all, in the eyes of those who do not accept the Church's teaching as to the Canon of Scripture, so absolutely absurd as it must seem to Churchmen, because as a matter of fact very large sections even of the early Church held quite erroneous views about such a document as the Epistle of Barnabas (to take only one instance) ; so, again, the difficulties regarding the integrity of the Second of Corinthians ought not to have been ignored.

We have made such criticisms as we have because we believe it is the best service a reviewer can do, and because the standard of these commentaries is so high that we wish to assist the writer in making them even better than they are.

*A Plain Commentary on the Minor Prophets. Compiled from various sources.* By the Author of *Christ in the Law*. (London : J. Masters and Co., 1888.)

WE do not feel that there is much to say about this small volume. The author does not add anything to the interpretation of the books he comments on, but he collects, in a way which may be useful to preachers, much that had been previously written. He does not neglect to notice the prophecies in relation to the times and the circumstances in which they were delivered, but has failed to collect illustrations from modern sources and discoveries. We are glad he emphasizes the Christian elements in the Old Testament ; he does not, however, strengthen the argument by occasionally doing so in a fanciful manner.

*Studies in the Book of Acts.* By J. WILLIAMS, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Connecticut. (London : James Nisbet and Co., 1888.)

BISHOP WILLIAMS has written this book with an excellent object in view. He wishes to help the ordinary Bible reader to study the Book of the Acts in a systematic and intelligent way. He wishes to prevent that 'fragmentary and desultory way in which Holy Scripture is too often read,' which is, as he rightly tells us, so disastrous. With this purpose he gives a clear, practical, and judicious commentary on the first twelve chapters, touching on most of the points which would interest or cause difficulties to the ordinary reader.

The chief points he brings out are, firstly, the way in which the whole work is a commentary on the words of our Lord, 'in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.' His purpose does not, unfortunately, allow him to emphasize the importance of this point, that the critical views of the Tübingen school lose much of their support whenever the real purpose of the Book is understood ; the object of the Writer, as every chapter shows, is the extension of the Gospel, not the reconciliation of different sects.

Secondly, he brings out the way in which the growth of a church, with all that that word implies, is narrated. 'We have seen the outlines, if nothing more, of its organization, its ministry, its sacraments, and its worship. We have been told of the doctrine committed to it to teach, the ideal and the law of life it is to enjoin on men, and of the great motive-power which stands behind and gives life to doctrine, ideal, and law' (p. 175). The *Acts* teaches history, does not directly give precepts, but it shows how from the very first, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the Church developed on the lines which it has since followed ; the distinctions there may be between the present and the past are trivial compared with the important points of agreement. The *Acts* has been called the most 'ecclesiastical' book of the New Testament, and yet it is remarkable that as a matter of fact the ecclesiastical sections are quite *incidental*. The author has no desire to give them set prominence, or to support any particular system ; he simply narrates what did exist, and so narrating, produces tenfold the effect on any impartial mind.

And, thirdly, this Book of the Acts is the 'Gospel of the Holy Spirit.' And as the Holy Spirit worked in the past, so it works now. It is important to notice that just the book which is ecclesiastical is the book of the Holy Spirit. The sacraments and ordinances of the Church are an expression of the belief in Him, and this belief prevents a misuse of these ordinances (see especially p. 177).

We may notice that it was not in the writer's purpose to touch much on questions of historical criticism ; occasionally, some mention of these, as, for example, the change in the character of the persecution produced by the development of Stephen's doctrine, which rouses the vehement Pharisee in the place of the indifferent Sadducee, would have brought out the historical character of the book rather strikingly. We have not noticed many mistakes, but we think it venturesome to ascribe a traditional value to a somewhat ingenious speculation of Theodoret (p. 160).

Faith  
R  
G

'ALL  
new in  
of the  
half.  
the mo  
wasting  
how '  
'integr  
of its c  
the ap  
'law'  
ceremo  
shall li  
Christ.  
will ask  
and the

Ho  
rations  
and ac  
motives  
there s  
and the  
Bishop  
will not

The F  
K  
Vo

THERE  
Macph  
fact wh  
translati  
says he,  
to the f  
subscrib  
the ame  
added to  
and 'su  
due to h  
mises to  
available  
volume  
his work  
tremely  
are due  
of the s  
ridiculou

*Faith: Active and Passive; Divine and Human.* An Exposition of Romans i. 16, 17. By the Rev. ARTHUR BEARD, M.A. (London: George Bell and Son, 1889.)

'ALL this is happily old and self-evident; but there is somewhat new in the mode of stating it' (p. 31). Whatever may be the truth of the first half of this statement, there is no doubt about the second half. Mr. Beard's style it would be a courtesy to call peculiar; it is the most grotesque we have ever met with. It is not worth while wasting our space with illustrations of it. His object is to show how 'one new idea makes all our knowledge new.' His new idea is 'integration,' as he calls it—that is, the study of a passage in the light of its context, an idea which is most excellent, but hardly new. By the application of this method he proves, firstly, that the expression 'law' in 'works of the law' means in the Epistle to the Romans the ceremonial law and not the Decalogue; and, secondly, that the 'just shall live by faith' means 'by the faith of God,' not 'faith in God, or Christ.' We leave these questions to the decision of exegetes, but will ask Mr. Beard how he will harmonize the one with Rom. vii. 7 and the other with the antithesis of faith and law.

However, Mr. Beard thinks he has solved a problem which 'generations of commentators have attempted and failed to solve' (p. 91), and accuses the translators of the Revised Version of 'political motives,' 'titubation,' 'instability,' 'timidity.' We may note that there seems to be some magnetic attraction between Mr. Beard and the Bishops. His work on Bar-Jonah was dedicated to the Bishop of London; this is dedicated to the Bishop of Carlisle. It will not do the Bishops much harm, or Mr. Beard much good.

*The Foreign Biblical Library. Church History.* By Professor KURTZ. Translated by the Rev. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A. Vol. II. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1889.)

THERE is an evident improvement in the new instalment of Mr. Macpherson's translation of Kurtz. He has taken advantage of the fact which was pointed out in these pages, and confesses that his translation of vol. i. was made from an early edition. 'Unfortunately,' says he, 'the translator's attention was not called until quite recently' to the fact that 'a tenth edition had appeared during 1887.' The subscribers to the *Foreign Biblical Library* owe us some thanks for the amelioration of the English translation. Mr. Macpherson has added to vol. ii. an appendix of thirty pages, containing 'additions' and 'substitutions' from the tenth German edition. It is honestly due to him to say that his work, notwithstanding its many faults, promises to be the best summary of Church history as a whole as yet available to English students. The criticism to which the former volume was subjected has made the translator much more careful in his work. He has again to be charged, however, with some extremely absurd renderings of the German into English; but these are due less to his ignorance of the language than to his ignorance of the subject-matter. Kurtz, for instance, never wrote anything so ridiculous as that 'the Pope nominates the cardinals into their high

position by the ceremony of closing and opening the *mantle*.' The word which Mr. Macpherson has translated 'mantle' is *Mund*, or 'mouth'; and if the translator had consulted any Roman Catholic account of the ceremonial of the Vatican he would have found that the Pope in secret consistory orders the new cardinal to shut his mouth, and not to speak until he is permitted to open it ('Claudimus tibi os'). The cardinal then leaves the consistory, and during his absence the Pope asks the other cardinals whether he 'shall open the mouth' of their new colleague. After they have given their opinion the new cardinal is recalled; he kneels at the Pope's feet, and the Pope says to him, 'Aperimus tibi os, ut in consistoriis, congregationibus, aliisque functionibus ecclesiasticis, sententiam tuam dicere valeas. In Nomine Patris, &c.' The Scotch wit of Mr. Macpherson seems to have jumped to the conclusion that the shutting and opening of the 'mouth' of one man by another must have been a mistake of his author, or of his author's printer. So he incontinently improved 'mouth' into 'mantle.' If our space permitted we could point out other instances in which Mr. Macpherson's generally good work as a translator has been damaged by his ignorance of all ecclesiastical matters beyond the range of modern Protestant experience, and by his culpable neglect to consult any authorities outside the pages of the original. We must also again complain of his reckless exclusion of one of the most helpful and valuable features of Kurtz's work, the summaries of the bibliography and literature of particular sections which that exact scholar has so conscientiously and carefully prepared for the use of the student. The lists of English, Scotch, and American books which Mr. Macpherson provides in their stead are no adequate substitute. The collections made by Kurtz upon *Volksthum und Nationallitteratur* are valuable to others as well as theological students, and it is a pity that his translator should have so mercilessly condensed, and even misrepresented them. The notes upon the place of the Devil in mediæval mythology are reduced to one thin sentence. To translate 'possenhaft' as 'blasphemous' may be a piece of Puritan wit. Mr. Macpherson's account of the 'Feast of Asses' shows that he does not understand what Kurtz tells the reader. It is not quite fair to omit what Kurtz relates about the Dominican translations of Holy Scripture. Does the editor suppose it to be dangerous for the Scottish student to doubt the Luther legend, or to be told that the Bible could be read, and was read, in the vulgar tongue before Luther translated it? Kurtz does not say that in popular plays 'all the holy actions were mimicked,' but he says that such plays were performed 'in holy places' ('an heiligen Stätten'), meaning in the churches and convents. Kurtz says that the revolutionary Stedingers of Friesland, who hesitated to pay the feudal dues to the nobles and the tithes to the clergy, 'were consequently defamed as Albigensian heretics' ('desshalb als albigensische Ketzler verschrien wurden'), which Mr. Macpherson oddly translates, 'They screened Albigensian heretics.' The translator is at his worst when he totally abolishes the text of the original, and introduces a judicial sentence of his own or a tradition of popular Protestantism as an

impro  
heretic  
Church  
Walden  
themse  
the oth  
student  
among  
Mr. M  
'all ec  
'eccles  
section  
his own  
and no  
Parlian  
Prayer  
Dissem  
When  
Reform  
pledgin  
idol-w  
Mr. M  
tion C  
Knox  
Mr. M  
when t  
Scottis  
Mr. M  
of Ind  
Kurtz  
'Apost  
gregati  
nomina  
and in  
libertie  
those v  
needs  
must n  
work by  
A Man  
W  
V  
WE ha  
English  
sary to  
printing  
sign of  
absolut  
of the



improvement or correction. Thus, in the section on the mediæval heretics, Mr. Macpherson oracularly states, 'The only protesting Church of a thoroughly sensible, evangelical sort was that of the Waldensians.' All that Kurtz says is that the Waldensians 'kept themselves in general free' from the revolutionary extravagances of the other contemporary 'Sekten.' Mr. Macpherson ought to tell the student that it is he, and not Kurtz, who has converted this one amongst the sects of the age into 'a Church.' It is not Kurtz, but Mr. Macpherson, who says that the English Parliament transferred 'all ecclesiastical rights and revenues to the king.' His adjective 'ecclesiastical' is a substitute for Kurtz's adjective 'Papal.' In the section upon Queen Elizabeth Mr. Macpherson inserts a sentence of his own, for which there is no equivalent in the original. It is he, and not the learned historian, who makes the assertion that 'the Parliament practically reproduced the earlier, less perfect of the Prayer Books of Edward VI.' He thus amusingly sets up Scottish Dissenting opinion as the standard of 'perfection' for a Prayer Book. When Kurtz says that 'the most devoted adherents of the Scottish Reformation, as the "congregation of Christ," made a covenant pledging themselves to advance the Word of God and to uproot the idol-worship of the Roman Church, as "the congregation of Satan,"' Mr. Macpherson omits Kurtz's two elucidatory phrases, 'Kongregation Christi' and 'Kongregation des Satans.' When Kurtz says that Knox 'adopted reformatory views' ('reformatörise Anschauungen') Mr. Macpherson corrects him and says 'evangelical views'; and when the historian speaks of 'the gloomy' ('finstere') strictness of Scottish Puritanism Mr. Macpherson substitutes 'moral' for 'gloomy.' Mr. Macpherson calls the reconciliation of Robert Brown (the founder of Independency) to the English Church 'his apostasy,' although Kurtz uses neither the words 'Abtrünnigkeit,' 'Glaubensabfall,' nor 'Apostasie' to describe it, but simply 'Abfall.' Kurtz says that Congregationalism became in America 'a powerful and influential denomination,' but Mr. Macpherson corrects him by saying 'a powerful and influential Church.' We have indicated a few of the many liberties which the translator has taken with the text as a hint to those who use the volume that, valuable as it is on the whole, it needs to be read with great caution, and that the learned author must not be blamed for the errors and prejudices imported into the work by his translator.

*A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament.* By Dr. BERNHARD WEISS. Translated from the German by A. J. K. DAVIDSON. Vol. II. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888.)

WE have previously had occasion to review the first volume of the English translation of this valuable work. We then found it necessary to comment somewhat severely on the carelessness of the printing in places. We are glad to say that this volume shows every sign of being very much better printed; we cannot say that it is absolutely free from errors; it certainly is free from the slovenliness of the former volume. The translation, too, is generally, where we

have tested it, correct. Of course the author has not succeeded in making it read like an English book: sometimes he indulges in really bad English (e.g. on page 172, note 2, lines 6-8); more often he arranges his little words awkwardly, or fails exactly to give the logical sense of German particles (e.g. 'noch,' on page 2, line 5, is incorrectly translated 'still'). In one place he has so definitely misrepresented the original that it is necessary to touch on the point more fully. On page 188, the reader will probably be surprised by finding the categorical statement, 'Notwithstanding all resemblance and borrowing, the theological standpoint of both [*i.e.* the Epistle and Gospel of St. John] must be regarded as different.' This statement is followed by a paragraph which definitely contradicts it. Again, on page 190, appear the words, 'However fully the substance and form of the Epistle show that it was the work of the Evangelist, there is no doubt that it cannot, as criticism has maintained since Dionysius of Alexandria, have proceeded from the Apocalyptist.' In exactly the same way as in the preceding case this statement is followed by several pages proving it is incorrect. We were very much puzzled by this contradiction, but a reference to the German showed us that the translator had fallen into a not unusual error. He is ignorant of the idiomatic use of the verb 'sollen' in German, and had not noticed that these statements are introduced by the words 'es sollte,' 'so zweifellos soll er,' turning them into *oratio obliqua*. These statements are made, not as the author's own, but as expressing the position he is studying or combating. Some means should have been taken to represent this idiom, and save what will cause a good deal of confusion.

For the convenience of those unacquainted with the book it may be convenient to indicate briefly Dr. Weiss's position. He is conservative (as it is called) in his views, but on purely critical grounds, and shows great capacity and often originality in the positions he adopts. The Epistle to the Hebrews, which he is inclined to assign to Barnabas, was addressed to Jewish Christians in Palestine just after the death of James, the Lord's brother. He assigns the Apocalypse to the beginning of the year 70, and combats the idea that the beast is Nero. He defends, on the ground of identity of style and resemblance to the speeches in the Acts, the two Epistles of Peter, considering that the first was written from Babylon. The Epistle of James he considers to have been addressed to Christian Jews of the Dispersion before the missionary journeys of St. Paul. His theory of the composition of the Gospels is complicated: on the Johannian questions he is cautiously conservative; on the historical character of the Gospel his opinion is 'that the author sought to reconstruct the discourses from fragmentary recollections. In not a few cases he has evidently only interwoven these recollections in an exposition of Jesus' leading points of view projected according to his own plan, and in so doing has also joined together, on account of their similarity of subject, utterances of Jesus that were separated in time' (p. 381).

The value of the book is that Dr. Weiss has every appearance of

having  
As  
cover  
that  
ignor

Aids

THE  
some  
which  
lisher  
have  
on in  
exhau  
may b  
the ge  
the of  
subje  
foreca  
of the  
ignor  
desire  
Churc  
Rome  
they h  
repug  
the au

But  
cerem  
made  
Vavas  
even  
of so  
of cer  
stater  
that a  
that t  
1549:  
of the  
Edwa  
Janua  
proof  
there  
sancti  
secon  
within  
author  
lines b

If,

having honestly arrived at his conclusions on purely critical grounds. As an extremely methodical compilation the book will be useful, as covering the whole ground and giving a complete summary of all that has been written in Germany on the subject. Dr. Weiss is ignorant of foreign theology.

*Aids to reverently celebrating the Holy Eucharist.* By E. H. (London : Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh—no date.)

THE publication of little books of ceremonial still goes on. We are somewhat puzzled to account for the continued appearance of works which can hardly commend themselves to the most enterprising publisher. The supply must be far in excess of the demand ; when we have seen second editions advertised again and again, we have found on inquiry at the booksellers that the first editions were not nearly exhausted. Moreover, the *Aids, Suggestions*, or whatever their name may be, have all so strong a family likeness, that if we only see one of the *genus* we may foretell with a good deal of accuracy the character of the others. They deal precisely in the same manner with the same subject. Given a new tract on ceremonial, one may safely hazard a forecast that the author will show a cynical indifference to the rubrics of the Prayer Book, a disregard of all Anglican tradition, an entire ignorance of the history and practice of ceremonial, together with a desire to make the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in the English Church as close a copy as possible of that which the converts to Rome have succeeded in setting up in the Communion to which they have betaken themselves. Another characteristic is the rooted repugnance in all of these writers to give to the Church the name of the authority who is thus good enough to instruct her in her duties.

But these particular *Aids* do not rise to the ordinary poor level of ceremonial books to which we are accustomed. Usually a boast is made that some modern third-rate ritualist like Baldeschi or Le Vavasseur has been followed. The work before us is innocent of even such erudition as that, and appears to represent the custom of some small district church with no traditions as to the rule of ceremonial. The very first lines of the introduction contain a statement made in the baldest manner, but so unlikely to be true that a proof of it may well be asked for at the outset. We are told that the preface to the Book of Common Prayer 'was composed in 1549.' E. H. may of course be in possession of convincing evidence of the fact, but it is historically certain that the bill sanctioning Edward's first book passed one of the Houses of Parliament on January 15, 1548-49. It is, then, not unreasonable to ask that the full proof of E. H.'s position should accompany his statement. Possibly there was no anxiety to bring into view the fact that the Act sanctioning the first Prayer Book of Edward was passed in the King's second year, quite at the end of the second year, it is true, but still within its limits. We notice a suppression of the words 'by the authority of Parliament' in a quotation of the ornaments rubric a few lines below.

If, too, we be bound by the ornaments rubric, as we believe we

are, we may really again ask E. H. to give us the evidence that he has for the existence in England of such a thing as the modern Italian birretta in any year of King Edward VI. In the woodcuts contained in the Roman *Pontificale* of 1520 and *Sacerdotale* of 1537, both published at Venice, there are priests with caps on their heads, representing, we presume, the Italian custom of the day. But these caps are altogether unlike the Italian birretta which we may see nowadays at the Oratory at Brompton. Possibly a cunning antiquary like Claude de Vert may be able to trace some connexion between them; but it is agreed on all hands that the present shape of the Italian birretta is certainly of post-Reformation date, if not quite modern.

The Liturgical translations in this little tract are among its most distressing features. Long custom has sanctioned the use of private prayers by the celebrant before the service begins, at the time of Communion, and at the end of the service; and it is a recommendation to such prayers that they be taken from ancient sources, though it would be an abuse of the word to call ancient the recension of the Roman Missal of 1570. And as ancient prayers are often in Latin, we may hope that most of the priests in the English Church are able to make use of them without being obliged to call in the aid of a translator. E. H.'s version of the Roman Missal never rises above the everyday effort of a schoolboy's task. Grotesqueness reaches its height in the Gregorian Canon, which we need not say is employed to force the Anglican Consecration prayer. What can we say of the taste (to use no stronger expression) which at the most solemn moment of the Christian Mysteries approaches the Most High, not in the stately and dignified language of the Prayer Book, but in halting sentences of vilely-phrased English? And then when private prayers are recommended, why should they be called 'secret prayers'? The very name seems designed to irritate and offend, and it is ill chosen; for it is not the opposite to 'common,' which is the sense which we presume was sought for. But 'secret' is the name given by the Roman Liturgy to a Collect after the Offertory, with which the private prayers recommended in these *Aids* have not one character in common. The confusion that may be caused by applying the same Liturgical term to two distinct things has not been weighed against the delight of using an obscure and new-fangled expression that may make people stare.

In the Introduction to Mr. Hammond's *Eastern and Western Liturgies*, p. lxxvii, there is a very useful list of books on elementary Ritual. It would be an immense advantage if everyone, before he were allowed to publish a fresh tract on ceremonial, were compelled to give evidence that he had thoroughly mastered all the books in Mr. Hammond's list. What a change would come over the character of ceremonial publications if such a simple course of study could only be insisted upon! The rubrics of the Prayer Book would be treated with the highest respect, and the very existence of the Pian recension of the Roman Missal be forgotten in the far simpler Liturgies of the West which preceded the Reformation.

1. *Parochial and other Sermons.* By the Right Rev. JAMES FRASER, D.D., second Bishop of Manchester. Edited by JOHN W. DIGGLE, M.A., Vicar of Moseley Hill, Liverpool. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1887.)
2. *University and other Sermons.* By the Right Rev. JAMES FRASER, D.D., second Bishop of Manchester. Edited by JOHN W. DIGGLE, M.A. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1887.)

THESE two volumes of sermons are of more than usual importance. All who have seen anything of Bishop Fraser's work in Manchester will know that he had the pre-eminent faculty of commanding attention. Business men would leave their business on week-days to hear the Bishop preach. What was the reason of this?

Anyone who reads these volumes will have no difficulty in answering that question; there is a spirit of reality and freshness running through them all which is wonderfully attractive. His thought is masculine and vigorous. He is learned, but he makes his learning answer to the needs of common life (note, for example, the way the Manichean controversy is handled, *Parochial Sermons*, pp. 14, 15). He goes directly to the point, and is not afraid of speaking on many things about which it is necessary and right, however unpleasant—if you speak at all—to speak out (see the 'Warning of Dinah,' *ibid.*, p. 220). Above all there is the constant determination that what he says shall be 'real' to him, and that what his congregation believe shall be reality to them. In the second volume of *University Sermons* there is the same characteristic. We cannot help quoting one passage on 'Character and Intellectual Progress':—

'This is an age,' he writes, 'when young men especially are apt to think they are scarcely responsible for their opinions. My own observation is, that while opinions tell largely upon character—levity in one direction producing levity in the other—so, too, character is a powerful factor in the formation of opinion. . . . My will may be nothing more than the reflex action of some part of my physical organization; but I am hardly prepared to accept that hypothesis as dispensing me from the claims of duty. The theory does not equip me better, but worse, for the battles of life. By the help of my moral sense—the primary intuitions of my nature—I struggle out of this darkness into something that is at least more like light again.'<sup>1</sup>

We recommend especially to our readers these volumes to be read and re-read.

But there is one point in connexion with the late Bishop of Manchester which is brought before us by some of these sermons, and by particular passages—the strong, not to say bitter, prejudices to which he gave vent against Catholic principles. This was all the more disastrous because, although he might be called a Low Churchman in some respects, or perhaps a Broad Churchman, he was not one who had broadened the Creed into unreality or narrowed the Church so as to disbelieve in its catholicity. He dwells continually on mechanical theories of the Sacraments, on excessive attention to minute

<sup>1</sup> *University Sermons*, p. 210.

ritual, on the danger of ultra-metaphysical creeds, on the simplicity of the Gospel. Now, as long as the statements remain general he is perfectly right. We agree with him in the danger of a mechanical theory of the Sacraments, just because we believe in the reality of the spiritual grace given by them. We would oppose an excessive attention to ritual in the place of worship, because we believe true ritual is a road to worship. But the mistake of Bishop Fraser was, he did not distinguish the one from the other. One instance will suffice. On pages 282, 283 of the volume of *Parochial Sermons* the question of Confession is treated. He shows the dangers of Confession, and lays it down that 'the benefit of absolution' is to be obtained from the priests of the Church of England, *but not through the medium of the confessional.*' He says 'what the law does not command it forbids,' and argues, on the ground of loyalty to the Prayer Book, against private confession. Now, the Bishop has, curiously enough, absolutely forgotten the first Exhortation in the Communion Service. He has made a serious mistake, which thus takes away the value of his statements. If he had recognized how confession was provided by the Church as an extreme remedy, and how loyalty to the Prayer Book demands that we should accept it as such, anything he might say against the dangers of the misuse of this remedy and the risk of any form of compulsory confession, would have a threefold value. And this would apply to other matters and, we may add, to other bishops. Once let them imagine that the teaching and work of the 'Catholic' party (as it is curiously called) are, and intend to be, the true expression of loyalty to the Prayer Book, and they would find that admonitions against ultra-ritualism, against Romanizing tendencies, against the evils of the 'extreme' section, would have a tenfold weight, and be supported by public opinion.

*The Laws of Happiness, or the Beatitudes, as teaching our Duty to God, Self, and our Neighbour.* By the Rev. ALFRED G. MORTIMER, B.D., Rector of St. Mary's, Castleton, N.Y. (Printed in America for J. Masters & Co., London, 1888.)

THESE addresses have been delivered by their author on more than one occasion, both in retreats and in his parish church. They were delivered extempore, and are now republished from the stenographer's notes. They work out the idea that the road to happiness as the road of duty is taught in the Beatitudes. We have read them with much pleasure: their teaching is healthy, their style is simple but eloquent, and the illustrations are telling. We give one extract (p. 87): 'The peacemakers, then, whom our Lord calls blessed, are not those who through cowardice avoid strife for truth's sake, but those who, contending bravely for the faith once delivered to the saints, and having won the victory of truth on earth, are able to help towards that great work of peace, which cannot be consummated until the peace of God which passeth understanding is realized in that Kingdom of God of which we read, "Peace is within her walls and plenteousness within her palaces."'

The  
C  
(1)

THIS  
the fir  
on fait  
the dic  
Englis  
of wor  
differ  
directi  
notice  
difficul  
senter  
the on  
tion'  
Quarte  
for a c  
to an  
of the  
tion.'

Tw  
like tha  
disaster  
instead  
might  
poor, a  
staff of  
second  
and ed  
depend

'If  
of whic  
appear  
the wri  
Mr. Ke  
In view  
pamphl  
pose th  
negativ  
himself  
'Reserv  
of the  
lawful,  
'the fir  
to do w  
Our  
Scotch  
the wri  
p. 71.

VOL



*The Island Missionary of the Bahamas: a Manual of Instruction and Routine in Ten Practical Addresses.* By EDWARD T. CHURTON, D.D., Bishop of Nassau. Second edition, enlarged. (London: J. Masters and Co., 1888.)

THIS is a most admirable book. It is divided into two portions—the first contains ‘a concise system of the most necessary teaching on faith and morals’; the second, practical directions on the needs of the diocese. Both parts seem to us almost as good as possible; to English readers the second part, bringing home to us the peculiarities of work in our Colonies, will be full of interest; the difficulties, different in many ways from our own, seem strange, and the practical directions given bring them home to us. We ask our readers to notice especially the remarks on ‘Tact’ (p. 97), in relation to the difficulties arising out of difference of race, or in dealing with dissenters (p. 105). We read with regret what we consider almost the only flaw in this excellent volume, viz. the remarks on ‘Reservation’ (p. 117). We are glad, however, to see that the *Church Quarterly Review* is mentioned among the books recommended for a clerical library, and we can only refer the Bishop of Nassau to an article on the subject (October 1887) in which the illegality of the practice in the Anglican Church is proved to demonstration.<sup>1</sup>

Two points we have noticed. The record of a scattered diocese like that of the Bahamas brings prominently before us the terrible disaster of the divisions of Christianity. If there was but one body instead of three working in the island the needs of outlying districts might be met without all the difficulties mentioned. The islands are poor, and it is just that that prevents them from supporting a sufficient staff of clergy when there is a struggle between different bodies. The second point is, Ought not some means to be devised for the creation and education of a native clergy? Must our Colonies be entirely dependent upon England?

<sup>1</sup> If we may judge from the harsh and seemingly unfair judgments of which this article has been the object in various quarters, it would appear to have been forgotten that it was with the *illegality* alone that the writer of the article professed, or was in any way bound, to deal. Mr. Kempe had published a pamphlet entitled *Is Reservation Lawful?* In view of the miserable sophistries and subterfuges with which that pamphlet was filled from beginning to end, it became a duty to expose them, and to give to the query propounded in its title an emphatic negative, couched in the plainest possible language. To have allowed himself to be diverted into a discussion of the *desirableness* of restoring ‘Reservation’ in the Church of England would have weakened the force of the reply. Good Bishop Churton seems to recognize that it is not lawful, but talks, ‘on the other hand,’ of a ‘Canon of Nicæa’ and of ‘the first English Prayer Book’ (1549). As if either of them had anything to do with answering the question submitted by Mr. Kempe.

Our readers will have seen that one of the proposed changes in the Scotch Liturgy is to *strike out the rubric permitting Reservation*—a rubric the writer adds, which ‘is without the slightest authority.’—See *ante*, p. 71.

VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVII.

R

*The Theological Educator Series.* (London : Hodder and Stoughton.)

1. *A Manual of Church History.* By the Rev. A. C. JENNINGS, M.A., Rector of King's Stanley. Two volumes (1888).—2. *A Manual of the Book of Common Prayer.* By the Rev. CHARLES HOLE, B.A. (1887).—3. *An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed.* By the Rev. JOHN EYRE YONGE, M.A. (1888).—4. *Outlines of Christian Doctrine.* By the Rev. H. S. C. MOULE, M.A. (1889.)

THIS series is intended to give 'a solid and trustworthy grounding in all branches of theological study.' It is also stated to be 'wholly unsectarian.' It is against this word that we wish to protest. Its use in this context is absurd. 'An introduction to the textual criticism of the New Testament' may possibly be 'unsectarian,' but how is that possible in 'Outlines of Christian Doctrine'? We do not wish, at present, to say anything against the book; we simply wish to point out that 'sects' are divided on subjects of doctrine, orders, and worship—that facts are in dispute between them, that they disagree on doctrines and on custom. How then can an account be given of doctrine which will not touch on sectarian points? As a matter of fact, Mr. Moule does, as he must, touch upon many points at issue; he defines many, and so far he is sectarian, and we are glad of it. Some other writers attempt to be unsectarian, and succeed in producing a lifeless manual. If it is once remembered that to be really 'unsectarian' the Divinity of our Lord must be held to be an open question—or Unitarians will have a perfect right to complain—the absurdity of the position becomes obvious. The only logical alternative to a statement of what the writer believes to be true is the historical position which regards all truth as indifferent, as unattainable, and so uncertain as to be practically unteachable.

1. Mr. Jennings has done his best at attempting to compress into two small volumes the whole of Church history, and is very modest at the result. 'He readily admits that such a historical method is of very small educational value.' He thinks it may be useful 'to candidates for examinations.' This is only possible if the examinations are as bad as some notoriously are, *i.e.* if they demand a mere string of dates and names. He has endeavoured to be fair, and has to a large extent succeeded, but his own opinions must appear sometimes. In vol. i. p. 5 he is dogmatic on the subject of the Eucharist; on p. 33 he calls Cyprian's view of the ministry Judæo-Christian; in vol. ii. p. 228 he says that the Evangelical party are 'text-tied and narrow in their sympathies.' His style is 'terse,' but he allows colloquial expressions to appear: *e.g.* 'doings' (p. 11), 'got rid of' (*ib.*), Marcion 'set up' as a teacher (p. 19). He occasionally misrepresents a position, owing to the need of compression (*e.g.* the Ignatian question). On p. 15 Quadratus is a mistake for Aristides. But we have not noticed many mistakes. An irksome task has been done as well as possible, and perhaps as well as it deserved.

2. 'This book aims . . . to assist those who are preparing for Holy Orders, and have to face the ordeal of examinations.' These words which we have italicised express, we presume, the object with which the work was written. 'It is to deal with all the details into which

the st  
branc  
what  
liturgi  
about  
is all.  
than t  
essent  
which  
like th  
An en  
and si  
referen  
would

3.  
synops  
sages i  
especia  
into H  
It is un  
Dr. M  
comme  
say, no

4.  
of muc  
is an ab  
view.  
'sectari  
may ha

*The Sp*  
W  
Ma

THE ch  
not orig  
expressi  
spicuous  
the Kin  
was the

'Eigh  
peasant,  
society i  
ably diff  
of its ow  
by its po  
Now, aft  
church w  
He desc  
beyond c  
be" (p.

the student's enquiries and the demands of examiners must needs branch out.' But what strange examiners they must be! A somewhat minute account is given, to take one example, of various ancient liturgies, but the student is given no means of arriving at anything about their contents. He must learn a number of names, and that is all. To read one liturgy through would be worth infinitely more than to know the names of all. The study of the Prayer Book ought essentially to be the study of great principles, and of the manner in which these have been expressed in the forms of worship. In a book like this it becomes a dreary record of names, dates, and minutiae. An enormous amount of information is collected in a small space, and side by side with lectures the book might be useful by way of reference; by itself it would, we imagine, be worse than useless—it would inspire a distaste for the subject.

3. This exposition of the Apostles' Creed is a pleasantly written synopsis of Pearson's great work. Mr. Yonge carefully avoids the passages in which Pearson has generally been admitted to be incorrect, especially his very confused article—*sit venia verbo*—on the Descent into Hell. Mr. Yonge's article on this subject is clear and to the point. It is unfortunate that it should have appeared at the same time as Dr. Maclear's much more thorough work; but we can cordially recommend it as lucid, generally correct, and certainly, we rejoice to say, not 'unsectarian.'

4. Mr. Moule's book on the 'Outlines of Christian Doctrine' is of much higher pretensions than the others we have mentioned. It is an able exposition of doctrine from a definitely Low Church point of view. We only mention it here in order to bring out more fully the 'sectarian' character of the series to which it belongs. We hope we may have an opportunity of returning to it at some future time.

*The Spiritual Life and other Sermons.* By the Rev. J. E. C. WELLDON, M.A., Head Master of Harrow School. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1888.)

THE chief characteristic of these sermons is their power. They are not original, they are not eloquent, but they have a strength of expression and argument which makes them stand out very conspicuously. We can illustrate this best by noticing the sermon on the Kingdom of Christ (p. 69). The preacher begins by asking what was the purpose of our Lord.

'Eighteen centuries and more ago, by the waters of Galilee, a Jewish peasant, without any special power or learning, said, "I will set up a society in the world; I call it God's kingdom. It shall be unmistakably different from other societies. It shall possess a life and character of its own. It shall present certain features which I describe to you, and by its possessing them you shall know it to be Mine." So He spake. Now, after the eighteen centuries and more we who are met in this church which is consecrated to His religion can say, "Such a society as He described exists in the world, and calls itself His. It originated beyond dispute in His teaching. It is essentially what He willed it to be"' (p. 78).

This is the main scope of the sermon, and the text is worked out with considerable power. But what of the failures of the Church?

'When people tell me, as sometimes they will, that Christianity does not commend itself to the unspiritualized intellectuality, whether of the world at large or of the university, I reply, "I know it, and it pains my heart; but it is what Christ leads me to expect." I am almost tempted to the paradox of asserting that, if the Church were more successful than she is, if her victories were more secure, or she could win them at a smaller cost of spiritual bloodshed, she would less exactly fulfil the prophecy of her Lord. . . . Remembering the vicissitudes of her history may I not apply to her retrospectively what was said long centuries before of her Divine Author, "Rule thou in the midst," not of thy subjects nor of thy friends, but "of thine enemies"?' (pp. 98, 99).

These extracts will hardly be sufficient to bring out adequately the merits of a sermon in which the witness of the Church to Christ and of Christ to the Church are set side by side. Future history, by fulfilling His purpose, tells us who that Jewish peasant was, and His words explain the difficulties that meet us in that history.

Mr. Welldon's sermons give us the idea that their writer has deliberately refused to allow any mental indolence to prevent him from working out for himself many positions which most people accept as proved. He refuses to take anything at second hand. Most men accept, for example, the reality of the spiritual life; Mr. Welldon found himself constantly using a term which he had not studied or verified, and patiently worked out for himself its meaning. And this leads to what we cannot help feeling will have seemed to many of his hearers a defect. His sermons end where most people's thoughts begin, and many would perhaps come away asking themselves whether after all they have learnt much. 'We know our spiritual nature exists; what need of all this elaborate argument to prove it? We feel as if we have heard this before.' But, it may be argued, we seldom expect to hear anything really new. That is true; but then, we do not expect that what is old should be told us as if it was new, and Mr. Welldon delivers every sentence and every doctrine as if it was a brilliant discovery of his own.

And this leads us to another point in these sermons which we feel bound to touch on. And that is, the tone of egotism and self-consciousness which runs through them. It is, we believe, partly the result of the natural self-assertiveness of a strong mind; it is partly the inevitable habit which must be engendered by the position of a head master towards boys. However it arises, it is too prominent to be overlooked. Take any page, and notice the constant expressions of personal opinions. '*I* venture to assert' (p. 92), '*I* am not saying this is not a sad result, *I* only say it is the result which Christ predicted. . . . *I* know it well, although *I* seem to see the blessing of the sorrow. . . . But *I* say it is what Christ Himself prophesied' (p. 93). It is not necessary to multiply instances. Now this may be only a trick, or awkwardness of style; whatever may be its cause we feel bound to notice it, and this we do, not as a mere critical objection, but on very definite grounds of experience. We have heard

many of those pressed but wejection which them by

When cause, w much o vigour w of Chris

### Spiritual

THE val known t appeal t can gain The key life seen He by c rogative as He w privilege all its b must be imaginat the obed

### An Intr

Wa Co.

DR. MA praise th tion to th

The fifty-three extendin able num have tes

The should g that is, t entirely untrue o be plent deeper s book lea difficult

many of these sermons preached, we have seen many—and especially those who were working out their first principles for themselves—impressed by the power and logical precision of thought they showed, but we have also known many who have definitely expressed an objection to the dogmatic and self-assertive manner in which truths, which they were half inclined to consider platitudes, were proved to them by arguments which might be good, but were not original.

Whether this be a defect of oratorical skill, or whatever be the cause, we have felt it our duty to draw attention to what has marred much of the good which might be done by sermons which, in the vigour with which they touch on questions which lie on the threshold of Christianity, are not often equalled.

*Spiritual Instructions. Our Lord's Early Life.* By the Rev. T. T. CARTER. (London : J. Masters and Co., 1887.)

THE value of Canon Carter's books of spiritual instruction is so well known that but little commendation is necessary from us ; they will appeal to a wide circle of readers who have learned what help they can gain from him in the development of their own life and character. The keynote of this volume of Instructions based on our Lord's early life seems to be self-suppression, self-abnegation, self-sacrifice. As He by condescending to live among men laid aside His divine prerogatives, as He suffered the mortification of His flesh in circumcision, as He was subject to His parents, so we must learn the duty and the privilege of obedience to the conditions of earthly life, self-denial in all its branches, and the mortification of all our earthly desires. We must be ready to mortify, not only our body, but our affections, our imagination, our judgment, our will, and 'bring every thought into the obedience of Christ.'

*An Introduction to the Creeds.* By the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D., Warden of St. Augustine's College. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1889.)

DR. MACLEAR's text-books of Bible history are so well known that to praise them is unnecessary. He has now added to them an introduction to the Creeds which we do not hesitate to call admirable.

The book consists, first, of an historical introduction, occupying fifty-three pages, then an exposition of the twelve articles of the Creed, extending to page 299, an appendix containing the texts of a considerable number of Creeds, and lastly three indices which, as far as we have tested them, we must pronounce very good.

The merits of a handbook we take to be these : the first is that it should give a short but correct and complete summary of the subject—that is, that on every question treated no important point should be entirely omitted. To omit is to give an inadequate idea, and so an untrue one. The second is that the references to larger works should be plentiful and good, in order to lead the way to a broader and deeper study of the subject. On both these points Dr. Maclear's book leaves nothing to be desired. But there is a third object more difficult to attain to, and that is to preserve and convey a sense of

the reality and elevation of the subject discussed ; in other words, to make a handbook something more than a handbook for examinations. It is in this that the merits of Dr. Maclear's book stand out prominently: he does not allow a scholarly devotion to details, or an educated theological accuracy, to prevent him from just saying enough to bring home to his readers that the subject-matter of his book is *vital truth*, and that the difficulties he is discussing concern nothing less than man's eternal salvation. As one example we may refer to what is said on the Athanasian Creed (pp. 46-53). There is an admirable account of its history, but Dr. Maclear remembers that this is not only an historical document, but a Creed of the Church which to many has been a stumbling-block. He reminds us therefore (p. 53), that its practical value has been shown in the missionary field, as proved by the testimony of such missionary bishops as a Macdougall, a Selwyn, and a Cotton, and that 'it does not demand, as a condition of salvation, a full knowledge of and assent to, the logical statements of the doctrines set forth, but it does solemnly warn all of the peril of rejecting the divine truth therein taught,' a statement which he corroborates by a parallel quotation from Canon Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*.

We may add that we know already that the book has been used with great advantage in ordinary parochial work.

*The Light that Lighteth every Man.* Sermons by ALEXANDER RUSSELL, B.D., late Dean of Adelaide. With an Introduction by the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D., Dean of Wells. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1889.)

A VOLUME of posthumous sermons has often a special work to do. It is published partly, no doubt, to help all those who may come across it, and to add what it can to swell the stream of Christian truth, but still more, it appeals to a wide circle of the friends of him who has gone, as a memorial of one who in his own sphere laboured well and truly for Christ. To many it will help to preserve the memory of one they loved, and they will hold rightly that it is a fitting way to prevent his name being quite forgotten. Such is the volume of sermons which we have before us, of the late Dean Russell of Adelaide. As we gather from the very pleasantly written memoir by the Dean of Wells, he was a pupil of Maurice and Hare, and had defended the former in his difficulties ; but he felt it his duty to keep controversial matters out of the pulpit, except on rare occasions. He has left behind him many in Australia who appreciate the work he has done, and who will be glad to have these sermons. In themselves they are certainly above the average. We do not feel quite able to echo the eulogistic hint of the editor, that on these sermons may be built up a posthumous reputation like that of Robertson. They are not commonplace ; they are vigorous in exposition, manly and real in tone. The two on the 'Mystery of Sin' and the 'Mystery of Evil,' preached on the morning and evening of Sexagesima, and containing one connected argument, are more remarkable than the others. The great question of the origin of evil

is treat  
There  
are ha  
who re

*The G*  
the  
an

Mr. H  
as a di  
who be  
the Rev  
has bee  
are, as  
but we  
original  
able, fo  
(Sermo  
confess  
stated i  
interpre  
which  
point, t  
be inse  
Russell  
satisfac  
other s  
anythin  
never g  
deed, in

*Thoma*

NEXT t  
secure  
as the  
as well  
was in  
name w  
Colerid  
Colerid  
and Joh  
and no  
frequen  
it must  
have d  
of his  
two me  
accepta  
this int



is treated with a power of reasoning we do not often meet with. There are so many volumes of sterling sermons published that we are hardly able specially to recommend the volume; but anyone who reads it will learn much that is good from it.

*The Godly Life.* Sermons preached in the Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields. By W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D., late Vicar of the parish and Prebendary of St. Paul's. (London: Rivingtons, 1889.)

MR. HUMPHRY was well known as Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, as a distinguished Cambridge scholar, as one of the 'five clergymen' who began the revision of the New Testament, and as a member of the Revision Committee. The volume of sermons which lies before us has been published as a memorial of his work as a parish priest. They are, as might be expected, scholarly in their tone and in their style, but we cannot say that we have found in them any great amount of original thought or appreciation of spiritual needs. We have been able, for example, to compare the sermon on the 'Mystery of Iniquity' (Sermon viii.) with similar sermons by other writers, and we must confess that we have not learnt much from it. The difficulties are stated in admirable language, the law of evil is laid down, inadequate interpretations are laid aside, and then the problem is left as one which is incapable of being solved. Now this is, up to a certain point, true; in the last resort, this question, like many others, must be insoluble. But a sermon, that we have noticed above, by Dean Russell will show how such a question can be treated reverently and satisfactorily. We have had the same feeling in reading through the other sermons in the book. We do not feel that we have learnt anything, or that any question which may be raised is solved. We never get beyond the limits of religious commonplace, expressed, indeed, in scholarly language, but not wholly concealed by eloquence.

*Thomas Poole and his Friends.* By Mrs. HENRY SANDFORD. Two vols. (London: Macmillan, 1888.)

NEXT to being a man of genius oneself, perhaps the best way to secure fame is to become the friend of a man of genius. Boswell, as the friend and biographer of Johnson, has immortalized himself as well as his hero; and Thomas Poole, as the friend of one who was in his way a man of greater genius than Johnson, has won a name which ought never to be forgotten so long as that of S. T. Coleridge is remembered. Not that the relations between Poole and Coleridge at all resembled those which subsisted between Boswell and Johnson. There is no humble subserviency on the one side, and no assertion of superiority on the other. On the contrary, Poole frequently plays the part of mentor to the wayward genius, and it must be confessed that in almost every case Coleridge would have done well to follow the very sensible and appropriate advice of his mentor. The whole story of the intercourse between these two men is intensely interesting; and the main charm in these two acceptable volumes is the additional light which they throw upon this intercourse. The writer is a blood relation of Thomas Poole,

and has had access to all his private papers, which, fortunately for posterity, he carefully preserved. She has made a most judicious selection of her relative's correspondence, and supplies the connecting links in a way which leaves nothing to be desired. Her remarks are always keen and sensible, and her style remarkably pure and racy.

The work is entitled, *Thomas Poole and his Friends*; but it really might have been entitled, 'Thomas Poole and his Friend'; for, though there are other friends, all of them men of sense, and some of them men of mark, whose correspondence with Poole is recorded, Coleridge is not only the central figure of the group, but his importance (in this connexion) quite overshadows all the rest. There are some names which we know, such as the Wedgwoods, Thomas and Josiah; Rickman, who has been immortalized by Charles Lamb; Thelwall, once notorious as 'Citizen Thelwall'; and William Wordsworth and Humphry Davy—greater names, some will think, than that of Coleridge himself; and there are some names which we do not know, such as a certain Mr. Purkis, a worthy and very sensible master-tanner, and a Dr. Majendie, Canon of Windsor, and Vicar of Poole's parish, Nether Stowey, whom Thomas Poole evidently regarded with esteem and love, mingled with reverence and even awe. But they all pale into insignificance, so far as the interest of these volumes is concerned, before the name of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.

The affection with which Coleridge regarded Poole is most remarkable. 'Among all his friends, he has ever called, and ever felt, you *the Friend*' (i. 2). 'My soul seems so mantled and wrapped round by your love and esteem, that a dream of losing but the smallest fragment of it makes me shiver' (i. 156). 'My God! My God! What if she [his wife] should dare to think that my most beloved friend has grown cold towards me!' (i. 188). 'Again and again may God be with you, my best, dear friend! O believe me, believe me, my Poole! dearer to my understanding and affections unitedly, than all else in this world!' (i. 268). 'Of many friends whom I love and esteem, my head and heart have ever chosen you as the friend—as the one being in whom is involved the full and whole meaning of that sacred title' (i. 273). This is the sort of language which Coleridge uses to, and of, Poole. It seems strange at the first blush that the most visionary of mortals should have felt so attracted by the most practical of men; but it really was the practical aspect of Poole's life which fascinated Coleridge. Poole had actually done what Coleridge always had some vague, dreamy notion of doing. Poole attended to his tan-yard and to his farm, and made them both pay, while at the same time he cultivated his mind to a very remarkable extent. Almost entirely self-educated, he managed to acquire a knowledge of more than one foreign language, and he certainly had such a knowledge of his own that he could write very pure and vigorous English. Now this was just Coleridge's ideal; the famous scheme of Pantisocracy (of which, by the way, Poole himself gives us the best and most detailed account which we possess) was to be eminently practical, though it was utterly impracticable. Here was a man doing amid the Quantock Hills just what Cole-

ridge proposed to do on the banks of the Susquehanna! And Poole thoroughly justified Coleridge's predilection for him. In the first place, Coleridge might well be grateful to the man who enthusiastically recognized his genius when a cold world frowned upon it. Poole was no mere worshipper of success. He admired and befriended Coleridge and Wordsworth when they were quite unknown; ay, and when they were worse than unknown—when they were suspected as dangerous characters! One of the most unconsciously humorous passages is that in which Poole assures his suspicious friends that William Wordsworth was really a respectable person! It seems almost incredible, but it is an undoubted fact, that Poole incurred considerable odium by bringing such firebrands as Coleridge and Wordsworth to Nether Stowey—Coleridge, the gentlest of men, who was nobody's enemy but his own, and Wordsworth, the very pattern of prim propriety! Nor must the material aid which Poole supplied to Coleridge be forgotten. He was too shrewd a man of business to put his money into a bag with holes in it, as he assuredly would have done if he had lavished it indiscriminately upon Coleridge. But he helped him judiciously, and collected subscriptions for him, and did it all in so delicate a way as not to wound Coleridge's sensitive and most honourable nature; and it was through Poole that Coleridge became acquainted with the Wedgwoods, his best benefactors. We have spoken of the good advice which Poole gave Coleridge, and cannot resist giving one or two specimens. 'You have given up the magazine. This I am not sorry for. I never liked the plan; you were not born to be a compiler. Your friends augur higher things, and don't, don't disappoint us. . . . *Original* works of genius are your forte. . . . You should set yourself about some work of consequence, which may give you a reputation, whether it be in poetry or prose; in treating it, delight and improve us all,' &c. &c. (i. 122). 'You are, dear Col., fixed in Germany, and what you have to do is to attend *wholly* to those things which are better attained in Germany than elsewhere. Let nothing divert you from them. Begin no poetry, no original composition. Speak nothing but German. Live with Germans. Read in German. Think in German. Stay long enough to do the business you are gone to do; but do it as quick as you can do it well' (i. 279). 'God bless and preserve you, and if it be possible, add to the great talents you possess, the punctuality of a common man' (ii. 14). 'Besides being a husband and a father, there are reasons which belong to few why you should take care of your health. The only security which mankind hath of retaining your spirit is the health of the frail bonds which inclose it. It is a spirit of much power cast among us—power, I trust, to be productive of good. But, remember, it has not yet fulfilled its errand'—and so forth *da capo*. The imperious and didactic tone may sound almost ludicrous when we think of the calibre of the two men, but the world would have been richer in its intellectual store, and Coleridge himself would have been happier, if he could have acted upon his sensible friend's suggestions—only, perhaps, with his temperament that was impossible.

How the coolness between the two friends came about is not quite clear; perhaps Coleridge's tender nature was pained by Poole's admonition, indeed he says as much (i. 191 &c.); perhaps his growing admiration, one might almost say worship, of Wordsworth tended to alienate him a little from his less gifted friend; perhaps Poole himself was a little jealous of Wordsworth, who was gradually supplanting him. At any rate a coolness *did* arise, and though the friendship was to a certain extent renewed in later years, that kind of breach is never really healed. This is shown in the very touching letter in which Coleridge meets the overtures of Poole for a renewal of their intimacy after a suspension of it for some years, when he quotes his own exquisite lines:

'Alas! they had been friends in youth,' &c.

The interest in Coleridge is so absorbing that we have left ourselves no space for dealing with Poole's other friends, nor with Poole himself. But it may be noticed, in conclusion, that though Poole, in his early manhood, like most thoughtful and generous young men of the time (Coleridge and Wordsworth included), was touched with the Revolution fever, and 'was a political Ishmaelite among his friends at Stowey' (i. 34), yet he was always a good Christian, and a sound, indeed a very active, Churchman; and not the least interesting part of these delightful volumes is that which describes his efforts to improve the parish church choir at Nether Stowey, to promote the education of the poor in day school and Sunday school, and his other works of piety and charity. All good was not reserved, as in the prevalent conceit of the day we are apt to think and say, to be done by our noble selves.

*Twelve English Statesmen.* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1888-1889.) 1. *William the Conqueror.* By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D. 2. *Henry II.* By Mrs. J. R. GREEN. 3. *Henry VII.* By JAMES GAIRDNER. 4. *Cardinal Wolsey.* By Professor M. CREIGHTON. 5. *Oliver Cromwell.* By FREDERIC HARRISON. 6. *William III.* By H. D. TRAILL.

IN their new series entitled *Twelve English Statesmen*, of which the above-mentioned six volumes have appeared, Messrs. Macmillan offer to the public a sketch of English history in the shape of biographies of the most important personages in the several crises which the nation has gone through. It would be difficult to amend the list of subjects without enlarging it, and in nearly every case the services of a recognized master of the period to be dealt with have been secured as biographer. There is some objection to the method of teaching great subjects by small books; but granting the taste of the times, the present series must be pronounced so far to be highly successful.

(1) In the opening volume of the series, Professor Freeman is dealing with the subject which he has, above all others, made his own. It is therefore unnecessary to say that his sketch of William the Conqueror is sound, clear, and interesting. One drawback there

is from the satisfactory nature of the book. It is impossible not to feel sometimes that he is hampered by the fact that he is writing a biography, and to wish that he were more at liberty to treat the period from an independent point of view—to go more at length, for instance, into the English side of the controversy between Harold and William, and to have, as in his great *History*, two heroes instead of one. But this does not destroy the interest of the story, and it hardly affects the latter half of it. Less than half of the book is occupied with the early life of William and the circumstances leading up to the Conquest. The rest deals with the settlement of England, and William's methods of dealing with the law, the land, the constitution, and the Church. These are large and complicated matters, but Professor Freeman, being a complete master of the subject, is able to present them shortly and clearly; and if the reader leaves the book with the feeling that he has been conducted rather rapidly over great issues, that is a natural result of the fashion for works on this scale, which indeed fulfil their purpose best when they send on the student with an appetite to tackle the greater authorities on the subject.

(2) In Henry II. Mrs. Green has to deal with one of the most picturesque and interesting figures of early English history. It was under Henry II. and Edward I., beyond any other rulers, that the constitution of England was struck out, and the lines laid down which have determined its subsequent development. Mrs. Green is therefore fortunate in her subject, and on the whole she is fortunate in its treatment. The sketch of Henry's character with which the book opens is brilliant in the extreme. The narrative is told with unflinching life and vigour, and she has a clear comprehension of the main constitutional features of the reign. We are not sure, however, that this clearness would in all cases be conveyed to a reader approaching the history of the period for the first time. Some of the pages which are devoted to rhetorical sketches of the effect of Henry's administration on his subjects, might perhaps have been more profitably employed in bringing out more clearly the connexion of the great reforms of the reign with the previous and subsequent development of the constitution. In the case of the quarrel with Becket, the story of which is vigorously told, a fuller account of the rights and principles at stake on each side seems to be needed. In spite of this, however, the book is a good one and very readable. No one can know the history of the period properly who is not acquainted with his Stubbs; but those who desire a slighter sketch as an introduction to the great work, and those who only wish for a clear and generally trustworthy narrative on a smaller scale, may safely be recommended to Mrs. Green.

(3) Henry VII. is not commonly looked on as one of the most interesting personages in English history. There are no striking events of either constitutional or external importance in his reign; and the character of the king himself is not such as to attract general attention or sympathy. At the same time the period is an important one in the history of England. It marks the end of one epoch and the

beginning of another. It shows England emerging from the chaos of civil wars and taking its place among foreign nations in the game of European politics which follows on the coalescence of the states of the Continent into something like their modern shape, with which the period known as the Middle Ages closes. Professor Gairdner has made a special study of this part of our history, and handles his subject clearly. Few people will read this book without discovering that Henry VII. was a more interesting person than they supposed. He was intellectually quite one of the ablest of all our sovereigns. A born diplomatist, he was far more successful in dealing with foreign nations, with far less display and expense, than his son and successor Henry VIII. Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the narrative of Henry's foreign policy, whereby he made England the arbiter of European combinations, and, with little trouble to himself, kept all foreign nations waiting upon him. The domestic history is more commonplace, any sensational policy being rendered impossible by the circumstances of the time as well as by Henry's temperament; but the futility of Perkin Warbeck's attempts on the crown is brought out very clearly. Professor Gairdner writes in a plain and business-like style, which suits the reign he is describing.

(4) In passing from the reign of Henry VII. to that of Henry VIII. the selectors of the subjects of this series must have felt some difficulty in deciding how to deal with it. Historians are not agreed as to the extent to which Henry VIII. himself determined the policy of his reign, and it might therefore have been difficult to select him as the leading statesman of the time. On the other hand, a history which closes with the death of Wolsey must inevitably be unsatisfactory in a way, as it lets down the curtain just as the most important act in the drama is about to be played. At the same time Wolsey is a very attractive figure, and intellectually beyond doubt the ablest English statesman of the reign. Professor Creighton, while admiring his abilities, is far from being his unbounded eulogist; indeed, the general impression left by the book is one of pathetic interest in a man who failed in everything. He failed, because he had a master whose objects were not the same as his own, and whose will was not to be overborne or cajoled. Professor Creighton presents us the picture of a statesman who had the threads of European diplomacy in his hands, and who delighted in manipulating them; a 'conservative reformer' of the most enlightened views in domestic policy; a man with far-reaching schemes for the extension of education and the welfare of the nation; who yet failed in all his aims, and died of a broken heart. One small error may be noticed in passing: the college which Bishop Fox founded at Oxford was not Brasenose (p. 142), but Corpus Christi.

(5) The two remaining volumes before us differ somewhat in character from the rest. In three at least, and to some extent in the fourth, of those already noticed, we have professed historians giving us in brief the result of researches in which they have themselves been principally concerned. In the two which follow we have men



of letters setting out for the benefit of the reading public the results at which historians have arrived. We do not gather that Mr. Frederic Harrison claims to add anything new to our knowledge of Oliver Cromwell. He has not even been able to make much use of Professor Gardiner's great work on the period. But, in fact, no new light can very well be thrown on this portion of our history without a discussion on minutiae which would be out of place in a work of this kind. It is unnecessary to say that Mr. Harrison's volume is written in a masterly, not to say brilliant, style. It is avowedly the work of an admirer of Oliver, and adopts in most respects the standpoint of Carlyle. Staunch royalists cannot be expected to approve of it very thoroughly; but the opinions of educated people are coming round to Cromwell, and those who admire and respect the central figure of our Revolution period will find here a powerful and sympathetic sketch of the life and character of the Great Protector.

(6) Mr. Traill is perhaps rather unfortunate in his subject; for, while he can hardly hope to be more brilliant in style than Macaulay, he cannot claim any great novelty or originality for his treatment of the character of William III. It is rather the fashion of the present day to depreciate Macaulay's authority, but in all essential points Macaulay's estimate of William III. holds the field; and although Mr. Traill differs on several occasions (and sometimes, we think, in a rather carping spirit) from the Whig historian, still in the main the impression left of William's character is the same. Mr. Traill has in fact little more than the advantage, if it be an advantage, of brevity. Apart from certain touches of a somewhat cynical humour, which are a little out of place in serious history, Mr. Traill gives a fair and readable narrative of one of the greatest crises of our constitutional history; and it is not his fault that his hero's life closes just as the scene is opening on the more sensational drama of one of the most brilliant periods in the military annals of England.

BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS,  
PERIODICALS, &c.

FOREMOST among 'new editions' must be placed *The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1866, on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury.* By H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's, and late Ireland Professor of Exegesis. Thirteenth edition (London: Rivingtons, 1889). Those who possess, and possess only, the first edition (1867), with its handsome type and ample page, must bear in mind that the additions made in subsequent issues have increased very largely the value of the book. Not only do we meet with additions in the body of the book, as in the notes at the foot of the text, e.g. the note on the *Didachè* (p. 217), and on the *Immaculate Conception* (p. 442), but the longer notes in what might be called the Appendix, at the end of the volume, are only four in number in the first edition, and are eight in the edition now before us. Each of these notes, it need scarcely be said, is the work of a master hand. Not

only are the notes doubled in number, but the notes originally appended have also been enlarged: that on *Lives of Our Lord*, containing, in editions subsequent to the first, a reply to Mr. Gladstone's favourable critique of *Ecce Homo*, and that on the *Worship of Jesus Christ*, following up the reply to Colenso by an equally crushing refutation of Dean Stanley's lucubrations on the Liturgy. The prefaces, again, to the later editions are full of thoughts which may well be pondered over by all who read them. Gladly, if our space permitted, would we extract from the preface to this edition the very striking comments on a well-known article by a well-known writer in the *Nineteenth Century* (March 1889) entitled 'The New Reformation.' The following is all we can find room for: 'The destructive criticism, though against its will, does Christian Faith a service. It clears away the brushwood which in many well-meaning souls obscures the interval between an infidel premiss and its real conclusion; and it exhibits the naked truth that between the adoration of Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and the rejection of Him altogether there is no reasonable standing-ground' (Pref. p. xxiv). It is well to add that the very meagre Index of Texts in the first edition has here been replaced by a much fuller one. It will be seen that owners of the first edition cannot dispense with the thirteenth. Amid much that is so discouraging in the visible decline of a studious and reading clergy, it is a satisfaction to feel that such a standard work as Dr. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures on the Divinity of Our Lord* has met with so large a demand. But we should be curious to know what proportion of the purchasers are laymen.

We are glad to see that a *History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices*, by Francis Procter, Vicar of Witton, 18th edition (London: Macmillan and Co., 1889), still retains its hold on public favour, and more especially we may presume on that of candidates for theological examinations. That it too has been carefully revised and added to by its venerable and highly respected author, may be inferred from the fact that the present edition numbers 483 pages (exclusive of the Appendix) as against the 453 pages of the 13th edition (1876). It is no doubt a good thing for theological students and clergymen to make themselves masters of Mr. Procter's or Canon Daniel's or Mr. Blunt's works on the Prayer Book. But it would be a still better thing if they would master the Prayer Book itself. How many Churchmen have ever read that Book through from end to end? Is it not too often taken as read?<sup>1</sup>

Of the *Petrine Claims: a Critical Enquiry*, by R. F. Littledale, LL.D., D.C.L. (London: S.P.C.K., 1889), it must of necessity suffice briefly to record this reprint from our own pages, with careful revisions and corrections. Many no doubt will be glad, and have (as we have good reason to know) long desired, to possess in a collected form the masterly essays which Dr. Littledale contributed to the *C.Q.R.*

<sup>1</sup> Incredible as it may seem, we know a case of a clergyman who was for ever grumbling because 'his congregation always would say Amen after the Absolution.' He actually had never 'noticed' the Rubric which immediately follows!

on the claims of the Papacy to sovereign authority over the Church Universal.

The Very Reverend the Dean of Windsor has done good service to the Church of which he is a distinguished ornament by the very careful way in which he has edited *The Lambeth Conferences of 1867, 1878, and 1888. With the Official Reports and Resolutions, together with the Sermons preached at the Conferences*; edited by Randall T. Davidson, Dean of Windsor (London: S.P.C.K., 1889). In his official position of General Secretary to the Conference of 1888 he must necessarily have enjoyed exceptional facilities for the task, and the result has been a volume which all Churchmen will prize, and for which we ask leave to offer him our warmest thanks 'from the ground of the heart.' It is interesting to learn, and many perhaps will hear of it now for the first time, that 'the first official step in connexion with the assembling of such a Conference was taken, not in England, but in Canada. . . . It arose from the interest awakened in North America by the Church affairs of South Africa' (p. 9). As the Dean of Windsor remarks, a decennial Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion seems to have become a recognized part of the organization of our Church, and we can only hope he may be spared to incorporate in some future edition of the present volume the proceedings of the Conference of 1898.

From *The Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature* (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, 1889) we have received four volumes of considerable interest: 1. *The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian*. By John, Bishop of Bristol, Master of Christ's College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. 2. *The History of Infant Baptism*. Part II. By W. Wall, Vicar of Shoreham, Kent. 3. *The First Apology of Justin Martyr*. Prefaced by some Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr. By John Kaye, formerly Lord Bishop of Lincoln. And last, not least, the *Cur Deus Homo?* of St. Anselm; to which is added a selection from his letters. To this volume is prefixed a Life of St. Anselm, bearing the honoured initials of R. C. The letters fill more than half the space. We shall be surprised if this volume does not command a very large sale. The *Justin Martyr* and the *Ecclesiastical History* are not up to the level of modern requirements and scholarship.

Whenever we come across the *English Historical Review*, edited by the Rev. M. Creighton (London: Longmans and Co., 1889)—and the very excellent July number of that publication is now before us—our first care is to search for an article by Lord Acton. Our search is in the present case rewarded by a most interesting review of Mr. Bryce's *American Commonwealth*. To no other living writer (as we believe) is it given to combine as Lord Acton does solidity and brilliancy.

We are glad to find that *Old Bibles, an Account of the Early Version of the English Bible*, by J. R. Dore (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1888), has reached a second edition. We are also glad to find that at the suggestion of the late Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. C. Words-

worth—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—Mr. Dore has appended the preface to King James's Bible of 1611, commonly known as the 'Authorized Version.' Mr. Dore's book is really extremely valuable and interesting. He is, we believe, quite right in saying that many of us forget by how long a series of versions the Version of 1611 had been preceded. We warmly commend this book to all readers. It is very beautifully got up, and may be had for the absurdly small sum of 5s.

*The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, edited by Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D. (Third edition, revised and enlarged. New York : Funk and Wagnalls, 1889), was fully noticed and justly commended in these pages when it first appeared.<sup>1</sup> The third edition, now before us, establishes still further claims on our attention, as on other and higher grounds, so also from the valuable clue it gives us to a complete 'Literatur' of the *Didachè*, which has now assumed almost formidable dimensions. The value of Dr. Schaff's labours in the field of ecclesiastical and theological literature we shall always be forward to recognize.

Of the articles in *The Theological Monthly*, July to September 1889 (London : James Nisbet, 1889), the most interesting to our mind is the article on 'Secessions to Rome,' by the Rev. J. J. Lias, and the 'Review of Essays in Biblical Greek,' by Dr. Weymouth—both of them in the August number. Mr. Lias does well to remind us that in spite of all the 'sound and fury' about 'Father Rivington' going over to Rome, not one single member of the congregation on the Riviera, which he was supposed to hold in the hollow of his hand, has thought fit to follow him.

The last number of the *Indian Church Quarterly Review* that has reached us is that for April (The Oxford Mission Press : Calcutta, 1889). In view of the present relations between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, the writer of the article on 'Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders' seems to us to be living in a fool's paradise. Of the books he has consulted on the subject, none, he considers, are 'more valuable than that by Dr. Lee.'

We bid hearty welcome—and we have not time or space to do more than welcome—to a new magazine which has been started on Church lines under the not very felicitous title, as it seems to us, of *The Newbury Magazine : a Monthly Review for Clergy and Laity*, July to September (London : Griffith, Okeden, and Welsh, 1889). Its very moderate price of one shilling will scarcely exceed the means, and a tempting mixture of light articles on all sorts of topics will furnish something within the intelligence, of any class of readers, lay or clerical, of all ages and both sexes. We wish it all success, and we are sure it will have it in its power to do some very good work, in a humble way.

<sup>1</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review* for January 1886, p. 484.